THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Harold D. Halderman

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E965
T582 47,396

VOLUME THE THIRTY-FIRST.

October 1919–September 1920.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

PRINTED BY
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON	SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
MANCHESTER	JOHN HEYWOOD.
EDINBURGH	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
GLASGOW	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
NEW YORK	CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXI.

AUTHORS.

Principal Walter F. Adeney, M.A., D.D.— PAGE
Synoptic Variations 487

Rev. Robert A. Aytoun, B.D.—
'No one shall snatch them out of my hand' 475

Mrs. Mary M. Baird—
The Gadarene Demoniac . . . 189

Ven. C. E. Blakeway, M.A., D.D.—
'Behold the Lamb of God' . . . 364

Rev. Albert Bonus, M.A.—
Luke 15^{30} 476

Professor F. C. Burkitt, F.B.A., D.D.—
William Sanday 20

Rev. P. A. Gordon Clark—
The Huntington Palimpsest . . 567

Professor H. F. B. Compston, M.A.—
Friendship without Mammon . . 282

Rev. Herbert Crossland, M.A., L.Th.—
Common Sense in Criticism . . 41

Rev. John Douglas—
The Neglected Interpreter . . . 375

Rev. George Farmer, A.K.C.—
A Group of Four Apostles . . . 331

Professor J. Dick Fleming, D.D.—
Belief in God and its Rational Basis . 535

Rev. H. W. Fulford, M.A.—
St. Paul and Euripides . . . 331

Professor W. Fulton, B.D., B.Sc., D.D.—
The Christian Church 279
The Gospel of Power 345

Rev. G. C. Glanville, B.D.—
The Aramaic Acts 38

Professor G. Buchanan Gray, M.A., PAGE
D.Litt., D.D.—
Job, Ecclesiastes, and a New Babylonian Literary Fragment 440

Right Rev. John A. F. Gregg, D.D.—
'I am the Good Shepherd': A Study . 491

J. Rendel Harris, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., D.D.—
Did St. Paul quote Euripides? . . 36

A. W. Hastings, M.A.—
The S.W.H. 330

Principal Archibald Henderson, D.D.—
Note on John 6^{37} 37
The Church's Message for To-day . 56

Rev. Arthur C. Hill—
Christ and the Will 174

Rev. W. F. Howard, M.A., B.D.—
Henry Scott 425

Rev. John A. Hutton, D.D.—
The Christian Community . . . 102
On Accepting Christ 233
The Holy Spirit and Christ . . . 454

Arthur Jones—
'Blessed are the pure in (of) heart, for they shall see God' (Matt. 5^{8}) . . 522

Rev. Maurice Jones, D.D.—
A New Edition of Wettstein . . 330

Professor A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D.—
The Samaritans 374

Rev. James Kennedy, D.D.—
Psalm 46^{1} 523

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AUG 14 1959

Professor Stephen H. Langdon, M.A.— PAGE
Archibald Henry Sayce . . . 118
The Habiru and the Hebrews . . 324

Professor H. R. Mackintosh, M.A., D.Phil., D.D.—
Christ and God 74
The Practice of the Spiritual Life . . 312

Professor D. S. Margoliouth, F.B.A., D.Litt.—
Jesus writing on the Ground . . 38
The Name Achikar 329

Professor J. Hugh Michael, M.A.—
Notes on the Johannine Prologue . 276

Professor George Milligan, D.D.—
The Grammar of the Greek New Testament 420

Professor James Moffatt, D.Litt., D.D.—
Thirty Years of New Testament Criticism 132

Professor Wilfrid J. Moulton, M.A., B.D.—
George Gillanders Findlay . . . 199

Rev. W. D. Niven, M.A.—
The Upsurge of Barbarism . . . 455

Rev. A. S. Percival, M.A.—
St. Chrysostom's Prayer . . . 522

Rev. J. M. E. Ross, M.A.—
The Disciplined Life 410

Right Rev. Herbert E. Ryle, D.D.—
Thirty Years Ago 7

Professor A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt.—
The Sumerian Epic of Paradise . . 187
The Scapegoat among the Hittites . 283

Professor C. Anderson Scott, D.D.—
An Aramaic Source for Acts 1–15 . 220

Principal W. B. Selbie, D.D.—
The New Attitude to God . . . 153

Rev. Fred Senior—
Luke 15^{30} 282

Rev. John Smith, M.A.— PAGE
'Faith' 282

Professor James Stalker, D.D.—
Testimonium Spiritus Sancti Internum . 246

F. Herbert Stead, M.A.—
A Labour View of Christianity . . 391

Rev. George Steven, D.D.—
Nicodemus 505

Rev. F. R. Tennant, D.D.—
Divine Omnipotence 34
The Conception of a Finite God . . 89
Creation, and the Origin of the Soul . 185

Right Rev. G. H. S. Walpole, D.D.—
Christ and the Affections . . . 264

Professor B. B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.—
Capitalizing 'Lord' in the English New Testament 188
Paul's Buffeting of his Body . . 520

Rev. W. A. Watkins—
Note on Luke 3^{16} 41

Rev. T. H. Weir, B.D.—
'The Only-Begotten' 521

Professor Newport J. D. White, D.D.—
John Henry Bernard 297

A. M. Williams, M.A.—
St. Paul's Speech at Lystra . . . 189
Reconciliation with God . . . 280

W. E. Wilson, B.D., and Rev. J. A. Smallbone—
Our Lord's Cry on the Cross . . 519

Herbert G. Wood, M.A.—
The Pilgrim Fathers and the Oxford Movement 546

Rev. H. J. Wotherspoon, D.D.—
The Use of Sign and Symbol in Worship 471
Fellowship in Relation to Christian Service 557

SUBJECTS.

	PAGE
Absolution	494
Accepting Christ	233
Achikar	329
Action	236, 334
Acts, Aramaic	38, 220
Adaptation	29, 261
Adventure	111, 139
Affections, Christ and	264
Africa, Social Problems	218
Amorites	27
Amulets and Charms	61
Animism	404
Apocalypse, Composition	396
,, Interpretation	403
Apocrypha, Lost	378
Apostolic Succession	258
Army and Religion	53
Ashes	230
Assisi	203
Atonement 253, 355, 380, 390,	514
,, in Quakerism	484
Attitude	66
Attractiveness	42
Authenticity	496
Authority	388
,, of the Bible	350
Baptism and Regeneration	564
Barbarism, Present Day	455
Bartholomew	331
Beasts	183
Beauty	231
Benedictines	159
Benedictus	307
Bernard, John Henry	297
Bible, Criticism	250
,, Lollard	497
,, as Source of Spiritual Life	313
,, Study, Conservative	9
Body, Spiritual	529
,, Subtle	263
Breathing	530
Brotherly Love	324
Buffeting	520
Cannibalism	107
Catholicism or Unitarianism	388
Child, Characteristics	337
,, of the Kingdom	339
Child-likeness	337
Christ, Accepting	233
,, Breathing on Disciples	530
Christ, Continual Presence	57
,, Divinity	386, 389
,, Emotion	146
,, in Ephesians	514
,, Failure	194
,, and God	74, 153
,, Indignation	146
,, King	555
,, Labour View	392
,, Living	514
,, Livingness	492
,, Lordship	57
,, Offices	554
,, Originality	482
,, Penetration	492
,, Person	385
,, Personality	512
,, and Physical Death	146
,, Presence	556
,, Priest	554
,, Prophet	554
,, in Quakerism	484
,, Resurrection	529
,, ,, Body	529
,, Revelation of God	482
,, Revolutionary	470
,, Self-consciousness	512
,, and Society	214
,, Teaching	393, 451
,, Temptations	3, 532
,, ,, Order	532
,, and the Will	174
,, Universality	491
,, and Woman	261
Christian	417
,, Community	102
,, Ideals	2
Christianity and Christ	512
,, Definition	482, 503
,, Ignorance of	54
,, Labour View	391
,, Originality	481
Chrysostom's Prayer	522
Church and Christ	392
,, and Christianity	392
,, Discipline	548
,, Doctrine of	539
,, Failure	193
,, Origin	102
Church, Preaching the	561
,, Purpose	429
Churchgoing	193
Comparative Religion	540
,, ,, Study of	375
Conflict of Duties	49
Considerateness	332
Consistency	420
Coral	126
Courage	517
Courtesy	238
Creation	185
Cross, Power	555
Crowd Psychology	542
,, Selfishness	553
Curiosity	12, 272
Death, Early	160
,, Second	262
Democracy	352
Demon Possession	1
Dereliction	66, 195, 519
Descent into Hell	68, 241
Devil, Personal	444
Discipline, Church	548
Disciplined Life	410
Discouragement	237
Discrimination	2
Disease	83
Divinity of Man	450
Divorce	548
Dragon	110
Dying, Pleasure	284
Ease or Enthusiasm	452
East, Changing	446
Ecclesiastes, Babylonian Fragment	440
,, Integrity	24
Ecclesiastical History, Study of	212
Education, Missionary	162
Eli	457
Emotion	227, 264
Episcopacy in N.T.	540
Eras of the World	197
Erasmus on Toleration	350
Erastianism	548
Eschatology, Gospels	5
,, Transmuted	5
Evolution of the Human Race	294
,, and Miracle	434
Example	274

	PAGE
Experimenting with God	534
Exposition, Notes of Recent	1, 49, 97, 145, 193, 241, 289, 337, 385, 433, 481, 529
Faith, Fellowship in	559
Fall, Theory	430
Fancy and Imagination	406
Fatherhood of God	77, 244
Fear of God	148
Fellowship	49
,, in Faith	559
,, and Service	557
Findlay, G. G.	199
Force, Use of	402
Forgiveness and Forgiving	439
Fourth Gospel, Prologue	276
Freethinker	400
Friends, Fewness	483
Fulfilment	381
Future Life, Christ's Teaching	23
,, ,, Knowledge	145
Gadara, Geresa, Kersa	1
Gadarene Demoniac	189
Gehenna	93
Gentleman	429
God, Belief in	535
,, Christ's	74
,, Corporeal	391
,, Experimenting with	534
,, Fear	148
,, Fellowship with	559
,, Finite	89
,, Hand	383
,, Nearness	433
,, New Attitude to	153
,, Revealed by Christ	482
,, Sociableness	190
,, Social Life	485
Gold, Value	110
Goodness, Cost	533
Gospel	242
,, Story, Truth	354
Grammar of Greek N.T.	60, 420
Gravity in Pastoral Epistles	410
Group Mind	542
Guidance	49
Habiru and the Hebrews	324
Happiness and Blessedness	98
,, in Union with God	99
Healing	141
Heaven	241
Hell	241
Helping	139
Heredity	169, 239
Holiness	321
Holy Spirit	244, 372, 387
,, ,, and Christ	454
,, ,, Inward Testimony	246
,, ,, Work	242, 246
Home	239, 419
Humility	48, 373
,, in Children	339
Humour, Scottish	304
Hymns, Devotional	266
,, Warlike	22
Idealism	272
Ideals	274
,, American	191
,, Christian	2
Immortality, Inge on	67
,, Substitutes	44
Incarnation	513
Incense	110
Infallibility	388
Infinity	89
Inge-iana	562
Inspiration	31, 99, 334
,, Blake's	100
,, Shakespeare's	100
Interpretation, Need	55
Inwardness	312
Jeremiah, Character	25
,, and Nature	26
Jerusalem	208
Jesus, Development	195
,, writing on the Ground	38
Job, Babylonian Fragment	440
Judas Iscariot	535
Judgment	242, 248
Jus Divinum	547
Kingdom, Child of the	339
,, of God	469
,, ,, Principles	323
Lazarus	146
Life, Fulness	516
'Lord' in English N.T.	188
Lord's Prayer, First Petition	195
,, Supper, Christ's Presence	213
Love, Gift	552
,, as Intelligent Good Will	379
,, in Religion	476
,, Word	116
Luke, Apocalyptic	5
,, Medical Language	30
Luther on Toleration	350
Lystra, Paul's Speech	189
Magi, Visit to Bethlehem	296
Manhood	182
Marriage Law	548
Materialism	349
,, Prevalence	54
Mercy	323
Message for To-day	56
Meteors	551
Miracles	390
,, Christ's	435
,, and God	430
,, Dr. Sanday on	289
,, Unimportance	4
Miraculous a Relative Term	435
Mirrors	225
Mission Societies	33
Missionary Methods	207
Missions, Education in	162
,, Study of	375
Modern Thought	32
Motherhood	336
Mottoes	158
Mysticism	159, 526
,, Definition	502
National Character	299
Nationality	108
New Testament, Criticism	132
,, ,, Grammar	60, 420
,, ,, Textual Criticism	21
Nicodemus	505
Obedience	315, 342
Odes of Solomon	445
Offences	229
Old Age, Blessing	87
Old Testament, Incompleteness	243
,, ,, Study Thirty Years Ago	7
Omnipotence	34
Only-Begotten	521
Ontological Argument	535
Original Sin	193
Oxford Movement	546
Paradise, Sumerian Epic	187
Pastoral Epistles, Atmosphere	410, 449, 496
Patrick, St.	109
Paul and Euripides	36, 331
,, Words on Women	63
Pearl	13

	PAGE
Penance	494
Pentecost, Phenomena in Isaiah	296
Perfection	194
Personal Religion	84
Philistines	379
Philo	258
Piety	420
Pilgrim Fathers	546
Poetry, Definition	311
,, New 46, 94, 141, 192, 239, 286, 335, 380, 431, 477, 525,	564
,, Value	29
,, Worst Lines	191
Possessions	430
Power	345
Prayer	106, 381
,, Book Revision	444
,, Chrysostom's	522
,, Intercessory	531
,, Meredith on	67
,, Power	540
,, Psychology	299
,, Reality in	531
,, as Source of Spiritual Life	313
,, in Spirit	373
Preacher as Politician	407
,, ,, Prophet	466
Preaching the Church	561
Presbyterian and Unitarian	428
Presence of Christ	320, 556
Prodigal Son	436
Progress . 128, 260, 447, 500,	562
,, Working for	294
Providence 51, 92,	139
,, and Scripture	249
Puritanism	495
Purity of Heart	522
Quietness in Pastoral Epistles	410
Receptiveness	342
Redemption	62
,, Fact	128
,, Need	128
Reformation, Essential Fact	58
,, Gains and Losses	171
Regeneration	448
Religion, First Principle	476
,, Institutional and Mystical	159
Remnant	410
Renan's Grandson	246
Resurrection of the Body	348
,, ,, Christ	495
Resurrection Narratives	377
Reunion	539
Revelation	467
Reward	564
Righteous and Sinners 339,	436
Righteousness 242,	247
Rightness with God	436
Robinson, John	541
Rocks, Hidden	465
Sacrifice	272
Saint, Characteristics	438
,, Modern Idea	315
,, The Word	436
Saints, Perseverance	438
Samaritan Pentateuch	408
Samaritans	374
Sanday, William	20
Sayce, A. H. 118,	140
Scapegoat	283
School Celebrations	429
Science and Religion	300
,, ,, the Supernatural	434
,, ,, Theology 385,	389
Scientific Method	210
Scottish Literature	27
Seeking	432
Self-consciousness	426
Self-consecration	373
Selfishness, Collective	553
Self-respect	137
Self-righteousness	343
Self-sacrifice in God	98
Seneca	542
Sermon on the Mount, Source	354
Service 324,	345
,, and Fellowship	557
Shadows	510
Shepherd, Good	491
Sign and Symbol in Worship	471
Silence	273
Simplicity	419
Sin, Conviction of 242,	246
,, Original	193
,, Sense of	483
Sincerity	272
Sobriety in Pastoral Epistles	410
Social Conscience	294
,, Life	516
,, Progress	26
,, Righteousness	323
,, Suffering	378
Solitude	210
Soul, Origin	185
,, Raiment	335
Spiritual Life, Practice	312
Spiritualism 158, 162, 171, 213, 290, 356,	360
State, Theory	540
Stones, Precious	404
Substitution	380
Suffering Servant	190
Surrender	341
Swearing	301
Symbolism in Worship	471
Sympathy 92, 321,	349
Synoptic Variations	487
Telepathy	64
Temptation	533
,, Christ's	3
Testimonies against the Jews	101
Testimonium Spiritus Sancti Internum	246
Theosophy	169
Theudas	192
Thinking about Christ	314
Thomas	181
Toleration	350
Topaz	81
Training and Education	447
Transfiguration	383
Transubstantiation	214
Trees	511
Trinity 245, 387,	485
,, in Quakerism	484
Trust 341,	373
,, and Knowledge	322
Virginibus Puerisque 10, 78, 124, 176, 223, 267, 316, 366, 413, 462, 508,	549
Vision 86, 106,	139
Waiting	319
Web of Life	28
Wettstein, New Edition	330
Will, Freedom	418
,, Importance	174
Wise Men from the East	296
Witness	345
Women, Ministry	63
Words, Big	168
Workers, Equipment	112
,, Religion	149
Worship, Symbols in	471

TEXTS.

	PAGE
Ex xxiii. 2	553
1 S ii. 20	419
iii. 13	457
2 K ii. 23, 24	243
1 Ch xix. 13	413
Ruth i. 14	227
Job xxviii. 19	81
Ps xlvi. 1	523
lxxiii. 18	80
ciii. 3	83
Pr xii. 22	267
xxvi. 7	223
xxxi. 29	366
Is vi. 8	466
xxv. 5	510
lxi. 3	230, 231
Jer i. 11	26
v. 26	317
Ezk xxvii. 16	126
Hos viii. 5	84
Joel ii. 13	226
Mt ii. 11	125
iii. 1–6	488
iii. 11, 12	490
iii. 13–17	490
v. 8	176, 522
v. 21	470
vi. 10	323
ix. 2	517
xiii. 45	13
xviii. 2	270
xviii. 4	339, 549
xviii. 7–9	229
Mt xxi. 2	268
xxiii. 8	316
xxvi. 1, 2	273
xxvi. 45	477
xxvi. 53	189
xxvii. 46	519
xxviii. 2, 4	477
xxviii. 20	320
Mk i. 1–5	488
i. 7, 8	490
i. 9–11	490
i. 15	469
ii. 3	45
ii. 14	417
ix. 36	270
xiv. 8	552
xiv. 41	477
xv. 34	519
Lk i. 74, 75	321
i. 78	556
iii. 2–7	488
iii. 16	41
iii. 16–18	490
iii. 21, 22	490
v. 10	317
vii. 8	246
x. 18	6
x. 23	462
x. 42	368
xiii. 19	511
xv. 8	415
xv. 30	282, 476
xvi. 1–13	282
Lk xviii. 23	271
Jn i. 3	276
i. 14	277
i. 14, 18	522
i. 16, 17	278
i. 29, 36	364
iii. 3	506
iv. 35	467
vi. 37	37
x. 10	516
x. 11	491
x. 28–30	475
xi. 16	181
xi. 43	275
xiii. 15	274, 318
xv. 13	415
xvi. 8–11	242, 246
xxi. 21	12
Ac i. 4	319
i. 12, 13	14
i. 14	16
i. 15	17
i. 21, 22	18
i. 24	82
i.–xv.	220
ii. 1	369
ii. 2	370
ii. 17	86, 87
ii. 37–39	131
ii. 38	372
ii. 47	38, 45
iii. 6	180
iv. 12	130
Ac x. 38	463
xxi. 39	36, 331
Ro i. 16	555
iv. 18	78
vi. 7	524
viii. 22, 23	128
xii. 11	508
xii. 21	418
1 Co ix. 26, 27	520
xiii. 2	178
xv. 32	183
xvi. 13	182
2 Co v. 14	124
v. 20	280
vi. 2	46
x. 12	367
Eph i. 1	436, 514
iv. 14	73
Ph i. 21	512
1 Th v. 17	373
2 Ti i. 12	322
ii. 2	10
He iii. 1	554
Jas i. 23	225
1 P ii. 4	417
ii. 24	514
1 Jn i. 1, 9	522
iv. 3	525
2 Jn 12	179
Jude 12	465
13	551

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

When Professor Huxley was at the height of his popularity as an anti-Christian apologist he entered upon a controversy with Mr. Gladstone about the miracles of the New Testament, and with unerring sagacity he chose for examination the healing of the demoniac. Others of the miracles are just as difficult to believe in. But this miracle offers peculiar opportunities for vulgar ridicule, and Professor Huxley knew how to take advantage of them. He called it the Gadarene Pig Affair. And from that day till now it has been felt that the man who dared to defend the story of the healing of the demoniac must have a considerable spirit of daring.

Yet that man has been found. The Rev. J. Alexander Findlay, M.A., is a scholar, thoroughly furnished with all modern instruments for weighing evidence, and fully aware of the latest criticism of the New Testament, and of its miracles. His book, *Jesus as They saw Him* (Epworth Press; 2s. net), is an exposition of the Gospel according to St. Mark, independent and scientific. Its scientific independence receives the weighty endorsement of Dr. Rendel Harris. 'These studies are not to be taken as an exhaustive review of what has been already said by others. They are fresh investigations with the aid of new instruments.' And Mr. Findlay believes in the Gadarene Pig Affair.

He does not once mention Professor Huxley. But at every step he exposes that very confident agnostic's ignorance. His first words are, 'With the Gerasene demoniac.' But Professor Huxley said 'Gadarene.' Did he really think that the evangelists were capable of making Gadara, a city six miles away from the sea of Galilee, the scene of the miracle? The scribe who first suggested it was as ignorant as the professor. The text had Gerasa. But the only Gerasa he knew was thirty miles from the lake. It was manifestly impossible that the pigs could have run thirty miles before they plunged into its waters. So he suggested Gadara. It does not seem to have occurred to Professor Huxley to inquire if there was, as we know there was, another place called Gerasa, the modern Kersa, on the very shore of the lake, from which it would be an accurate description to say that the swine 'rushed down a steep place into the sea.'

But this is a case of demon possession. Does Mr. Findlay believe in that? He does not need to believe in it. He does not need to believe that Jesus believed in it. Call it what you will. Mr. Findlay calls it a case of 'multiple personality'—a modern and quite scientific name for a scientifically recognized mental disorder. The point is that the man believed in it. The man himself believed that he was possessed with

demons. And Jesus had to cure the man with such a belief firmly fixed in him.

Mr. FINDLAY does not know whether Jesus believed in possession or not. But he says that in this scientific age we are coming to that belief. 'We who are appointed to live in an age which often seems to be demon-ridden are not so ready as were the men of the last generation to scout the idea as mere superstition.' More than that, he says that we are coming to the belief that the sins which we call 'animal sins' are more appropriately named than we imagined. But all that is beside the question. The question is, Did this lunatic believe that he was possessed by demons, and did he require for his healing some ocular proof that the demons had departed from him, such a proof as the sight of the swine plunging violently down that steep place into the sea?

What are your ideals? What do you live for? You are a Christian. Very well; what, as a Christian, do you live for? What are your Christian ideals? Miss Agnes S. PAUL, M.A., late Headmistress of Clapham High School, offers a choice. You may take one or more and leave the rest. You had best take them all.

Miss PAUL has published, through the Student Christian Movement, a short series of addresses given at Clapham High School to students in training for teaching. The title is *Some Christian Ideals in the Teaching Profession* (3s. net). They are addresses to teachers. And they make one wonder how it can ever be that a teacher should be content to teach, or ever choose to be a teacher, without having Christian ideals. It may be that when the reading of this book is over the reader may be able to think himself back into a situation in which Christianity has no significance, or only an ornamental significance. But while the reading is going on it will be difficult for the most secular mind to withstand the impression that the teaching which is not the teaching of Christian ideals is, at the very best of it, no better than a beating of the air.

What are Christian ideals? One of them is a sense of proportion. In the heading of the chapter Miss PAUL calls it 'A True Sense of Values.' She also describes it as discrimination. It enters into life on every side. 'One sometimes finds people in whom it is somewhat dormant or blunted about externals, but very much alive with regard to the things of the mind. Its sphere or range, you see, varies; and in the things of the spirit too there is scope for its action and assuredly need and call for its use.'

'Some people possess, by nature or "grace," or perhaps both, a discrimination and instinct for the best, of which you can feel the workings in all your dealings with them, whether they may have actually expressed definite opinions or not. They have a certain atmosphere round them which raises our standard of thought; their way of looking at things is in itself a sound judgment. With others it is different. We feel after being with them (again possibly without the interchange of any definite opinions) that certain things we have thought or said are to be regretted; we wish we had been more on guard, less influenced by their outlook, for they have brought out the elements in us that we are rather ashamed of and would gladly suppress; their standard of value is wrong.'

Miss PAUL says that discrimination is an instinct. 'An instinct for the best,' she calls it. But she does not mean that you have it by nature or you have it not. 'The critical faculty can be trained and a sound judgment acquired in this sphere as in others, and by the same means, namely by living in the right atmosphere, by accustoming ourselves to use the best as a standard. And no amount of zeal or enthusiasm will make up for the lack of such discrimination. There is a passage in the Epistle to the Philippians which explains that though love is to be the moving force in our lives, it is to be a force directed by knowledge: "that

your love may abound more and more in knowledge and all discernment, so that ye may approve things that are excellent." That is, you must use not only your capacity for fervour and devotion, but all your faculties; your highest power of vision to reveal to you what is most worth doing, your common sense to tell you how to do it.'

This, then, is one of the Christian ideals. It is discrimination of values. It is seeing things in their right proportion. And the seeing of things in their right proportion 'is a characteristic so important as to be almost the test of complete sanity; for the word "unbalanced," used of those who have lost or have never had the sense of the comparative values of things, carries with it the implication of a lack of complete mental health and poise.'

It enters into life on every side. 'You will remember how large a part of the Greeks' achievement of beauty in sculpture was due to their sense of proportion. The same faculty working in another way shows itself in all provinces of creative art, including literature, in that most vital part of an artist's business, the work of selection; for it is one of the most essential things to know what may be left out and what must at all costs go in. Again we find the same faculty in another sphere of human thought acting as the source of a sense of humour. How refreshing to meet a person who knows when a thing is really serious, and when it is only worth a laugh! And on still another plane, in the world of business and commerce, the necessity for a sound instinct for values is too obvious to need comment.'

It enters into the spiritual life. But here Miss PAUL arrests herself. Is it possible that some of those students who are in training for teaching recognize no life in themselves beyond the physical and mental? Miss PAUL is very gentle with them. 'If we do not feel that we can arrogate to ourselves any claim to much of a "spiritual life" at all,' then say 'those thoughts of ours about life which dominate our minds and determine our actions.'

It enters into the spiritual life. It enters into the narrative of Christ's Temptation in the Wilderness.

For what do the three acts of that temptation mean? They mean 'the rejection of certain things apparently desirable in themselves, and typical of desires common to all humanity, on the ground of the superiority or far greater value of something else. This "something else" turns out to be really one thing, expressed in three ways as modified by the different forms of the experience. Christ met these typical problems of His own life, and, we must conclude, means us to meet ours, by keeping hold of one standard of value—loyalty to God and reference to Him as the central fact, and indeed the reason, of our existence. There may be, and probably are, many other truths wrapped up in the teaching of these passages, but this clearly is the main thread running through them.'

Take the first temptation. 'In the answer, "Man shall not live by bread alone," Christ does not deny that man's physical life is dependent on certain necessities, and his natural desires concerned with them. But He shows that there is something of so much greater importance that in comparison with it no lesser desire or need can be taken into consideration. His judgment apparently rejected as unsound the idea of exerting "miraculous" power for the satisfaction of the lesser need; and by using only the forces of faith, love and loyalty, forces which are available for our use also, He conveyed to us the truth that if in doing God's will we have to experience pain or deprivation, God will doubtless sustain us through them.'

Take the second temptation. 'In the answer, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," there appears the same steadfast loyalty, the same con-

viction about the one thing which is of supreme value. To prove by a short dramatic or melodramatic method that He possessed superhuman powers was not the important point. His choice was very different. The powers He called upon in facing this problem too were such as man also can use, these same powers of faith, love and loyalty. "He was made man" in the sense of choosing to keep to the way that man had to go; to accept man's limitations and yet achieve, from out of their network of hindrances, the highest. And for man the highest, the pearl of great price, is a right relationship with God.'

Take the third temptation. 'The answer, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve," is the most comprehensive and final expression of the three. Against such clearness of vision, such a true and secure judgment of value, the inducement "All these things will I give thee" could not have much chance of prevailing.'

'The last experience,' says Miss PAUL, 'may perhaps be taken as typical of a kind which may befall people who, after starting out on their life-work with a pure and single aim, become entangled in material preoccupations and obsessed against their will by the feeling of the importance of external things. It is easy for them to justify to themselves such preoccupation by telling themselves that everything is an asset if it is used in a good cause. They want, so they think, to get a good position, because then they will have a wider sphere of influence for good. But by the time the wider sphere is theirs, the spirit which was to pass out in influence may have fled like a "fugitive essence," the jewel may be missing from the setting they were so carefully preparing for it. No amount of external power or influence will make up for the loss of the inner light. Christ's answer in that third experience went again straight to the root of the matter. You must care for nothing but God's will. If you desire earnestly to serve Him, He will find ways for you to serve Him well, and you need not concern yourself about position or influence. He can give them to you if your work needs them. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God."'

Mr. G. G. COULTON, of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, in his book, *Christ, St. Francis, and To-day*, told us that 'what most separates the churchman inside from the man in the street outside, is the current ecclesiastical conception of physical miracles. The multitude is slipping away from the Wesleyan, as from the Anglican and from the Catholic. You may test this for yourselves; in every serious religious discussion, the argument will soon settle down to this question of miracles.' Yet here is a book written by another Cambridge scholar in which the question of miracles is dismissed as scarcely worth discussion.

The Rev. S. C. CARPENTER, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Selwyn College, has made a prolonged study of St. Luke's Gospel, and now publishes the result in a handsome volume with the title of *Christianity according to S. Luke* (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net). The title is an appeal to the public. So is the book. But it is of the most exact scholarship. It may be taken without hesitation as representing the latest research work of the modern mind. Yet the fact that many of the events in St. Luke's Gospel are miraculous 'need not,' says the author, 'detain us long.'

Why not? For several reasons. 'First, because we are no longer in the eighteenth century. At that time on the one hand it was supposed by many that a story containing miracles, if not actually an indication of *mala fides* on the part of the writer, could anyhow be dismissed at once. On the other hand Christianity was sometimes defended on the ground that the evidence in favour of its miracles was well up to the legal standard, and was accordingly sufficient to establish the truth of the religion. Secondly, because we are no longer in the nineteenth century, when, in the first enthusiasm of certain newly realized

and overwidely dominating conceptions, it was supposed that the universe was made for law and not law for the universe.'

From this 'accident of birth' there proceed two results. 'We no longer, with Paley, attempt to prove Christianity on the evidence of its miracles; we have, in fact, reversed the process. And, in the second place, the discussions which took place forty or fifty years ago on the *a priori* possibility of miracle have been replaced by consideration of the "creative" nature of evolution or, in more definitely theological language, of the freedom of God. It has become much easier to believe in miracles, but on the other hand Christians attach less importance to them, and are prepared to believe that some other name may presently be found for them.'

Does that mean that the miracles in St. Luke's Gospel are not miracles? Not altogether. It means that 'the spiritual exaltation of the early Christians and the discernment which they unquestionably possessed of the veritable, eternal truth of God were accompanied by a remarkable control over human bodies and perhaps other material things.' But it also means that the resurrection of Christ is a literal physical fact. For 'the despair into which the disciples of Jesus had been plunged by the Crucifixion was quickly changed to a condition of happy faith, which is only to be explained by believing that their Master had really risen from the dead.'

Now if Christ Jesus rose from the dead, everything else about miracle, says Mr. CARPENTER, 'is comparatively unimportant.' We may then take the specific miracles and apply to them one by one the ordinary canons of historical probability. 'Let us be fully conscious of the simple faith which led S. Luke to accept without any kind of philosophic hesitation the traditions that Jesus had raised the widow's son and the daughter of Jairus. But if we nevertheless believe that Jesus is one to whom such operations are normal and natural, that "the Lord of all good life" could hardly be manifested among men without affecting His environment in some such ways as these, let us not stumble at the fact that the narrative is miraculous.'

To the mind of Mr. CARPENTER there is a much more serious difficulty in St. Luke's Gospel than the Miracles. It is the Eschatology. It may be that the 'eschatological difficulty' presses hard on the modern mind because it is modern. The time may come when men will be as much astonished at the magnitude it presents to us as we now are astonished at the size of the supernatural difficulty as science presented it to our fathers. Meantime we have to take it as we find it. And no one will deny that it is a serious matter to accuse our Lord of raising expectations of a speedy return which were not fulfilled, and a difficult task to acquit Him.

The Evangelists themselves were aware of the difficulty. And they have their solution, 'although with varying emphasis and consistency.' 'The "Coming" was, for the time being, realized when the Church was born. In particular S. Luke is associated with the belief that the dispensation of the Spirit in the Church is a real continuation of the Life of Jesus. But he is also concerned to shew that the Life of Jesus was the necessary exordium to the dispensation of the Spirit. Where the King is, there is the Kingdom. This is what has been described as Transmuted Eschatology. It is not found only in S. Luke, but it is a feature of his Gospel. It means that events which have hitherto been supposed to be connected with the future advent of Messiah are actually occurring now.'

Is there any parallel? Mr. CARPENTER finds one. 'English Churchmen,' he says, 'will readily recall the phrase of the Catechism, "I was made . . . an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." Is the kingdom there present or future? Does inheritor mean one who has already inherited or

one who will inherit in the future? Plainly, it means both. The Church of the baptized is a real home of grace, and its members have a real communion with the heavenly world. But they are not yet perfected.'

But what evidence is there in the Gospels themselves that the 'Coming' of Christ was not altogether future? One item Mr. CARPENTER finds in the mysterious saying, 'I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven' (10[18]). That saying was uttered on the return of the Seventy. 'This has been thought to refer to the Temptation, or to the original fall of Satan, but it probably means, "While you were on your mission you were but reaping the fruits of My concentration here. I wrestled with the demons, and so they were exorcised at your word."' Mr. CARPENTER quotes Professor Sanday: 'What He meant was that the victory over the Power of Evil was virtually won. The healing of those few demoniacs might seem a small thing . . . it was really a crisis—*the* crisis in the history of the human race.' It seems to signify that the fall of Satan was already an accomplished fact.

'More certain are the following: At the first sermon in Nazareth (iv. 21), "to-day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." The Sons of the bride-chamber are not to fast while the bridegroom is with them (v. 34). "Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see" (x. 23). "If I with the finger of God cast out demons, no doubt the kingdom of God *is come upon you*" (xi. 20). Whatever be the meaning of the famous phrase, "The kingdom of God is within you" (xvii. 21), at least the time referred to is the present. The kingdom has to some extent arrived already.'

'Above all, there is the reply sent back to S. John Baptist when he asked, "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?" The reply is a frank appeal to the signs of the kingdom which are before the eyes of the messengers. "Go, and tell John what things ye have heard and seen: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear: the dead are raised up and the poor have the Gospel preached unto them" (vii. 22).'

That is the first thing, then. St. Luke rescues the apocalyptic element in the teaching of Christ from its association exclusively with the end of all things. It is part of the complete and permanent gospel. But that is not enough. There is a catastrophic element in the apocalyptic. What is to be done with it? How does St. Luke himself deal with it?

He does not reject it. Canon STREETER, it is true, detects a slight tendency in St. Luke to tone down eschatological language, and Mr. CARPENTER admits that 'in this as in some other respects S. Luke's is the mildest of the three Gospels.' But there are catastrophic passages even in St. Luke. How does the Evangelist himself regard them?

Some of them he would find fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem. In 21[20], for example, he 'substitutes for the mysterious phrase of Daniel the much more intelligible gloss, "Jerusalem compassed by armies."' But there is more than that, and it is more important.

'One of the most striking features in the character of the Apocalyptic Christ, as depicted by S. Luke, is His attitude of being constrained and borne along by an absorbing—even violent—sense of mission. It is in this direction that Eschatology has done so much to vindicate Christianity as a real religion. One of the conclusions of the eschatologists in which there is surely a great deal of truth is that Our Lord solemnly and deliberately approached His death, believing that it would release forces which were required for the establishment of His kingdom. S. Matthew and S. Luke would agree that it was His Death and Resurrection which burst the bounds of merely Jewish nationality. And S.

Luke is, of course, particularly associated with the position that His Ascension and Return at Pentecost completed the process of universalization, and made Him available for the needs of all lands and all times.'

'Thus the Lukan solution is of two kinds. The religion of Jesus was capable of being carried over into the quiet, regular processes of a Church, and the Church itself was only an extension of the Incarnate Life of Jesus. Jesus of Nazareth, Who required faith in those around Him, Who demanded from them an intense activity of co-operating prayer, was well assured that, though God His Father would shortly make Him Lord and Christ, yet His Lordship and His Christhood would not become perfectly effective till all Israel should be saved and the fulness of the Gentiles should come in. His own appointed triumph and the coming of the kingdom with power and great glory lay on the other side of death. But that death would be for the ransom of many. The spiritual children of His Body were already come almost to the birth. But without the Cross He would not have strength to bring them forth. Only that Baptism of blood would summon into being the sons and daughters that God would give Him. His pangs would be their life. And the new life to which He Himself should come through death would then be their life for ever. Parent and children, Saviour and saved, Christ and His Church, for ever.'

Thirty Years Ago.

By the Right Reverend Bishop Herbert E. Ryle, D.D., Dean of Westminster.

Thirty years have passed since I was privileged to contribute to The Expository Times a series of articles, which later on were collected, revised, and published as a little book, with the title of *The Early Narratives of Genesis*. Those articles were based on a course of lectures which, as a young Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, I had been giving once a week in the evening at the Divinity Schools to a small but enthusiastic group of students. So far as I can recollect, it was the obvious interest and pleased excitement of those lads at what seemed to them a novel treatment of the subject which encouraged me to offer the lectures to a wider public through the medium of The Expository Times. I owed it to the kindness of the Editor, Dr. James Hastings, that they were permitted to appear in this form.

Well! since those days we have travelled a great distance. We, who now belong to the older generation, can look back to that time 'thirty years ago,' and can thank God that, so far as Old Testament study is concerned, a great advance has been achieved. The legitimate claims of scientific literary criticism have come into general recognition. The history of the People of Israel, and the story of the growth of their religious ideas and institutions, have been far more minutely investigated than ever before. A flood of light has been thrown upon the field of study by the unexpected treasures of Assyriology, and by the development of the new branch of learning represented in the lore of Comparative Religion. Hebrew, and the Semitic languages generally, are better understood, and more intelligently taught than they were. In every branch much still remains to be done; but we can be truly thankful, both that so much has been done, and that in Great Britain it has been done on lines which have satisfied the just demands of intellectual progress, and have inflicted no outrage upon that loyal reverence with which every devout Christian turns to the study of the pages of Holy Scripture.

People nowadays could hardly credit the dearth of good English books on the Old Testament at the time, forty years ago, when I was reading for Theological Honours. We had Maclear's and Smith's *Old Testament Histories*; we had the inspiring eloquence of Stanley's *Jewish Church*; we had articles in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*. We had Wordsworth's *Commentary* and the *Speaker's Commentary*. We had Pusey on *Daniel*, and on the *Minor Prophets*. On the Psalms, we had

Perowne's *Commentary*, and the more recent *Commentary* by Jennings and Lowe—both of them being very helpful. For fuller treatment of special books we turned to translations from the German, in T. & T. Clark's Series, *e.g.* Delitzsch on *Genesis* and on *Isaiah*; Keil on *Samuel* and on the *Minor Prophets*. There were also the translations of Ewald's and of Kuenen's *Histories of Israel*, and of Bleek's *Introduction*, which were accessible in libraries. Let me add that, looking back to those days, there were few books which I found so full of suggestive thought as well as useful information as Oehler's *Theology of the Old Testament*, in T. & T. Clark's Translation Series.

In the present day the student has no lack of literature of every kind. On all the most important books of the Old Testament there are now full and scholarly English Commentaries, meeting all the requirements of the time. The 'Cambridge Bible' is now complete for all the books of the Old Testament, and is brought up to date in matters of scholarship and criticism. 'The International Critical Commentary' is on a more ambitious scale; it discusses not only the general questions of interpretation, but also all the minuter details of text and scholarship. The 'Century Bible,' though quite small in size, has also rendered valuable service to students. The 'Expositor's Bible' has enriched the shelves of every Bible lover with the volumes by G. Adam Smith on *Isaiah* and the *Minor Prophets*. 'The Westminster Commentary' has not as yet gone very far; but if it follows on the lines of Driver's *Genesis*, it will occupy a useful place. The young student now has no need to have recourse to dull translations of foreign commentaries. Modern scholarship is fully represented in the living style of the best English works. Helps to study, of most varied kind, are easily procurable.

The great book by Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, gave an immense impetus to the expansion and liberation of thought upon the Old Testament; while the now classic work on *The Literature of the Old Testament*, by Driver (1891), must always rank as one of the most important influences which contributed to the transformation of educated English opinion upon the subject of the structure and contents of the Jewish Scriptures. Smaller 'Introductions' now abound; and when I see such excellent and compact *Introductions* as those of Bennett and Adeney, of Box and of Gray, I cannot help feeling that the young student in these times has no ground for the kind of complaint to which an earlier generation used to give copious expression. For what young British reader need now turn to the stilted and often obscure translations of foreign books? The materials within his reach by English, Scottish, and American writers will abundantly furnish him with all that he wants. In this connexion it is only just to remark upon the epoch-making service that was rendered to the cause both of theology and of scholarship by the famous *Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by Dr. James Hastings. This magnificent treasure-house of learning placed within the reach of teacher and scholar alike the best results of the most recent Biblical study. The *Encyclopædia Biblica*, though somewhat disfigured by a strain of fanciful speculation, has also furnished the student with an indispensable work of reference.

The magnificent *Hebrew Dictionary*, edited by Brown, Briggs, and Driver, has given Hebrew scholars a weapon for which they had long been looking. It is based on the monumental work of Gesenius; but in matters of philology, idiom, literary criticism, and exposition it marks the progress that had been made during the previous century. Its appearance has been a credit to Anglo-American scholarship, as well as to the famous Press of the University of Oxford, which undertook its publication.

The work that was begun by such men as Robertson Smith, Cheyne, Davidson, Driver, Kirkpatrick, George Adam Smith, and Kennedy has been taken up and carried on by a great host. I think of Cook, Burney, Ottley, Selbie, Box, Cowley, Gray, Simpson, A. S. Peake, Wade, and Harford, of Oxford; Kennett, Skinner, Bevan, Barnes, McNeile, Chapman, Macleane, Nairne, S. A. Cook, Bennett, Adeney, Foakes-Jackson, and Lanchester, of Cambridge; Brown, Briggs, Harper, Moore, Kent, H. P. Smith, Barton, Thatcher, Curtis, Toy, and many others in the United States. These are names which at once occur to my mind, and in mentioning them I must plead guilty to forgetfulness of many others deserving to be recorded; for I am writing this at a distance from books. But I am aware I must not allow myself to be run away with by a not unnatural interest in the bibliographical aspect of the great change that has taken place in Old Testament studies since 1889.

After all, the main difficulty thirty years ago was not so much the lack of adequate literary assistance as the attitude of mind on the part of those who in the religious life of the country during the previous thirty years had been responsible for the guidance and direction of thought upon the subject of the Old Testament. It is probable enough that in England the fierce controversies which had raged around *Essays and Reviews*, and had led to the denunciation of the writings of Bishop Colenso, had produced an inevitable reaction. Weariness, disgust, satiety, uncertainty, and timidity may each have played their part. Many of the ablest scholars had been engaged between 1870 and 1880 upon the work of the Revised Version. An enormous amount of minute and careful study was thus being silently done. For some little time, indeed, little was published. But there was a new spirit at work. It was not without significance that young men were at this juncture appointed to chairs for the teaching of the Old Testament—Driver at Oxford, Kirkpatrick at Cambridge, Robertson Smith at Aberdeen.

The impeachment of Robertson Smith for heresy on account of the articles he had written on Holy Scripture, and more particularly on books of the Old Testament, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, produced a prodigious cleavage of opinion in Scotland. In England the trial was at the time strangely ignored. People were a little put off by the technical terms in which the conduct of the case was necessarily obscured. But the popular lectures in which Robertson Smith sought to explain to the world his views upon the Old Testament and the structure of its books, views which, he contended, were demanded by modern scholarship, gave rise to an immense sensation. It was the beginning of a new era. A conflict between old traditional ideas and the 'new learning' was as inevitable at the close of the nineteenth century as it was at the beginning of the sixteenth.

We have to remember that thirty years ago the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration was more widely accepted, and in a cruder form, than it is now. Moreover, it was the case then, as it is now, that many good and thoughtful persons who would disown any belief in Verbal Inspiration considered that the cause of Christianity was at stake if the traditional views about, *e.g.*, the authorship of the Pentateuch, of the Psalter, or of the prophet Isaiah, seemed to be questioned. Literary criticism was, as it were, warned off the Christian preserves of Holy Scripture. Its motives were denounced as atheistical: its results derided as merely destructive.

Thirty years have steadily confirmed the justice of the demand that the Bible should be subjected to the free application of the same methods of literary and historical study as other ancient writings. In the learned world a revolution has taken place: the so-called 'critical position' has been universally accepted. Upon matters of detail, as in every living science, there are, and always will be, differing views in plentiful abundance. They testify to the vigour and health of an unfettered and inquiring intellect. But the old traditional system of explanation, respecting the authorship and structure of the books of the Old Testament, respecting the formation of the Canon, and respecting the undeniable presence of contradictions in the Sacred Writings, can no longer be regarded as tenable. The principles which some of us advocated thirty years ago, and on account of which we were denounced as 'unsound' and our lectures labelled 'dangerous,' have now been generally adopted in the teaching of the Universities, both in Great Britain and in America. The 'New Learning' has triumphed.

But do not let us suppose that the triumph of the 'New Learning' denotes a revolution in Christian thought generally. The great majority of the people receive their notions about Holy Scripture from devout persons who have never read an article of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and have never heard of Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament*. They still receive instruction from class teachers and Sunday-school teachers, who have been trained on antiquated lines, and have been told to study 'safe,' but obsolete, handbooks. The ordinary layman assumes that what he was taught as a child about the Bible is Christian truth, and that no departure from it is justifiable. He is not prepared to trouble himself over literary problems. He says to himself: 'Moses wrote the Pentateuch; David wrote the Psalms; the whale swallowed Jonah; and what is the good of Christian faith if it does not enable you to believe things like that?'

I received a letter at the beginning of this month from a clergymsn telling me that 'Amongst the masses of the population it is almost universally accepted that you *must* either believe in the historicity and literal accuracy of these [Genesis]

records, or else disbelieve the Bible altogether. *And the clergy almost universally acquiesce in this attitude of mind*, because—as they truly say—the subject is a difficult one, and it is easier to let it alone. But this policy of reticence is having a most disastrous effect. It is indeed very largely responsible for the "alienation" from religion of which we hear, and see, so much.'

My correspondent puts his finger upon a real danger. The 'masses of the population' do not read. The short sermons which are addressed to them cannot deal with literary questions. The children are taught on the lines of an ancient and now obsolete system of thought. The young men and the young women repudiate what they wrongly suppose to be the only Christian view of the Bible. They have never heard of the 'new learning' by means of which their difficulties might have been explained, and their objections at least met, if not answered, in a scientific manner.

I am always grateful for the work that month by month is being quietly accomplished by the instrumentality of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Much, however, remains to be done. The learning of the University has to be interpreted to the occupants of the classroom and the schoolroom. Those who have to teach must themselves have learned. The people generally are not yet in touch with the progress of Old Testament studies. It is no good for superior persons to say, 'We have got long past that problem: that was the problem of thirty years ago.' They do not realize how long it takes to effect a revolution in thought: how small is the proportion of the population that reads, and how much smaller is the proportion that thinks. I do not think I am guilty of any exaggeration when I say that the great mass of our Christian fellow-countrymen are still wholly unacquainted with the principles which some of us were teaching in the Universities thirty years ago, and which are now practically universally welcomed in the *learned* world. The Bible is the people's book. The people will love it better and revere it more intelligently when they become acquainted with the more modern method of explaining its difficulties and of interpreting its spiritual message. I doubt not the present generation will loyally cope with the task of teaching the teachers. We of the older generation are passing away. Our successors have profited by our mistakes; they will make up for our deficiencies; they will popularize that which is still only the privilege of the comparatively few. But there can be no going back to the traditional position of 'Thirty Years Ago.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'A good soldier of Jesus Christ.'—2 Ti 2^3.

ONE October day long ago—it was in the year 1849—there was born in a manse in Aberdeenshire a little baby boy. His father was a Free Church Minister, and owned the honoured Highland name of Mackay. The little boy was christened Alexander.

The father was a learned man who loved teaching. Nothing delighted him more than instructing his little son. At the age of three Alexander could read the New Testament, and at seven he was reading books like Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Then the two often walked out together, and the country people used to wonder why they stopped occasionally as if to look at something on the road. The little fellow was getting a lesson in geography from a map drawn on the road with his father's stick, or he was having a proposition of Euclid demonstrated to him. With such a father it is no wonder he grew up to be a man who did everything thoroughly.

Alexander's map-drawing was exceptionally good. Two famous geologists who visited the manse were greatly struck with the accuracy of his work, and one of them sent him a copy of a book called *Small Beginnings, or the Way to Get On*. He was very proud of it, and read it with enjoyment. Later he began to take an interest in machinery. He loved to see it in motion. He would walk four miles to the nearest railway station, and four miles back, on the chance of getting a look at the engine as the train stopped

for a minute or two on its way north. When he was sent to be a pupil at the Aberdeen Grammar School, he frequented the shipbuilding yards on every possible occasion; he was also a frequent visitor at the studio of a photographer he knew; so you see he had the spirit of the mechanic in him as well as that of the student.

Like many another Aberdonian he was undemonstrative; if he loved any one very much he would not readily say so. A person watching him at his work might even conclude that his was one of those stolid natures that have no room for affection. Even on the day of his mother's funeral, when his heart felt like to break, and a dear friend of the family delivered his mother's Bible to him with her dying message to 'Search the Scriptures,' he said little. But years after he wrote to this friend that she had more to do with his being a missionary than she knew of. That was his way of saying that on that saddest of days he made the great resolve of his life.

He remained the mechanic and student, but in both spheres the religion of Jesus Christ dominated his thoughts. To him it was the greatest thing in the world. He was ready to give his life for it. What else could he be, then, but a mechanic-missionary? He offered himself as such, was accepted by the Church Missionary Society, and sent out to Uganda in Africa. Uganda is a country lying north of the wonderful African lake called Victoria Nyanza. Look for it in your map of Africa.

And what a missionary he became! Religion was not a mere thought in his mind. It was like a law in his heart—a law that he could not disobey, because he loved the Heavenly Father who put it there. It influenced everything he did and said. So long as he was speaking of worldly matters to the heathen King of Uganda he was careful not to give offence, but when it was a case of discussing the relationship between God and man, Alexander Mackay spoke straight out. You see, he felt sure about what was right in the eye of God. 'It is not mine, but God's command,' he used to say. He was so full of love to Jesus Christ that in spreading His gospel he felt God Himself was at his back. Away in that far-off land, while he taught the African boys to be blacksmiths, joiners, boat-builders, and farmers, he led them to think of higher things. Stanley, the great African traveller, visited the mission station. Alexander was then a middle-aged man. Let me tell you some of the things Stanley said afterwards about the little man whom he found all alone in a desert part of Africa. Mackay had seen his friends murdered, his converts clubbed, and yet he could look out on the world with the clear blue eyes of a boy.

'If ever man had reason to be doleful and lonely and sad,' said Stanley, 'Mackay had when, after murdering his bishop, and burning his pupils, and strangling his converts, and clubbing to death his dark friends, Mwanga turned his eye of death on him, and yet the little man met it with calm blue eyes that never winked. To see one man of this kind working day after day for twelve years bravely and without a syllable of complaint or moan amid the wilderness, and to hear him lead his little flock to show forth God's loving-kindness in the morning and his faithfulness every night, is worth going a long journey for the moral courage and contentment that one derives from it.' His pupils told Stanley how much Alexander Mackay had done for them. He saw for himself how they read their Gospels, and he heard one of them say, 'There are about 2500 of us belonging to Mackay's Mission.' And there is nothing more beautiful in the whole story than the picture given of the missionary by one of Stanley's party in a letter written to his father after Alexander's death. Let me read part of it to you. 'His kindness, his goodness, his cleverness, his gentle sincerity and kindly cheerful ways endeared him to us all. I shall never forget the morning we left Usambero. He walked part of the way with us, and wished us good-bye; and one's whole heart went out to him when he took my hand and wished me God-speed. That lonely figure standing on the brow of the hill, waving farewell to us, will ever remain vividly in my mind.'

And so we leave him, for he died in that land he loved so well. But he died for a great cause. Alexander Mackay's courage was the courage of the soldier. He was a good soldier of Jesus Christ. And many boys and girls capable of his zeal in the great cause pass through our Sunday Schools every year.

Once a girl heard a missionary address one Sunday afternoon years ago. There and then she made up her mind to go to be a missionary when she grew up. And she went.

Curiosity-Boxes.

'What shall this man do?'—Jn 21^{21}.

If anybody were to ask me what I thought the most striking thing in the character of boys and girls, do you know what I should reply? Well, I think I should answer 'Curiosity.' Boys and girls are always wanting to know things, they are always asking questions. Of course grown-up people want to know things too, but if you counted the number of questions a grown-up person asked in a day and the number a small boy or girl asked, and compared the two lists, I think you would find that the small boy or girl had asked at least ten questions to every one asked by the grown-up. No wonder that children are often called 'curiosity-boxes.'

Why is it that boys and girls are so curious? Well, I think God made them like that so that they might learn things. Have you ever looked into the eyes of a baby? They are just one big question. He seems to be wondering about everything. And as soon as he begins to be able to put words together he asks questions. It is just his way of learning all about the big world into which God has sent him.

Now, when some of us older people were about as big as you are, our fathers and mothers used to believe that children should be seen and not heard. I don't know that there wasn't a certain amount of wisdom in that, but the result was that a great many questions we wanted to ask were never answered, and we had to wait and wonder till we could find out the answer for ourselves. I don't think your fathers and mothers are often like that. I fancy they are quite ready to let you ask questions, and that they generally reply to them when they can. But I want you to remember that there are some questions in regard to which you will have to wait for an answer till you are older. Sometimes father and mother refuse to answer our questions, and we have got to take them on trust and believe that they know best.

Now some people talk about curiosity as if it were a wrong thing, but that is a mistake. Most of the big inventions and discoveries are the result of curiosity. Men have wanted to know and prove things, and they have searched and experimented until they were successful. If people had not wanted to find out more than they knew already we might still be savages living in dens and caves. So, you see, curiosity is not a bad thing in itself. But it may be used in bad or foolish ways. Shall I tell you some of these ways?

1. Well, first, there is the curiosity that wastes itself in trifles that are of no possible account or use. Did you ever hear the story of the man who was so inquisitive that he could never rest till he knew the why and the wherefore of everything? One dark night he was walking home from an evening party and he saw a lamp-post with a sign on the crossbar. It was too high up for him to read in the dark, so he 'shinned' up the lamp-post, evening dress and all. What do you think was written on the sign? 'Wet paint!'

Now, sometimes boys and girls ask questions just for the sake of asking, and when I hear them I always think of that man who scaled the lamp-post. Only it is generally others who suffer by their curiosity and not themselves. A witty man once said of a certain inquisitive friend, 'Talk to him of Jacob's ladder, and he will ask the number of the steps.' And there is often just about as much sense as that in the questions some little people ask.

2. That kind of curiosity is rather silly, but, after all, it does not do very much harm to any one except that it rather annoys those of whom the questions are asked. But there is another kind of curiosity, which is really harmful. It is undue curiosity about the affairs of other people.

That was the kind of curiosity Peter showed in our text. Jesus had been telling him that one day he should die for his Master's sake, but Peter was not content to know about his own future, he wanted to know, too, what was going to happen to his friend John. And Jesus rebuked him. 'What is that to thee?' He asked, 'follow thou me.' 'I am well able to look after John,' He seemed to say; 'trust his future to Me, and don't waste your time or your energy wondering what will happen to him. Your real concern is to follow Me.'

Now some people are never happy unless they know all about their friends and neighbours. They are always poking their noses into their affairs and trying to find out all their secrets. This is a very mean kind of curiosity; there is something very sneaky about it. Don't have anything to do with it. Never search other people's drawers or read their letters; never listen to conversations you are not intended to overhear or try to find out the weak spots in your neighbour's character. Don't be a sneak. Be above that sort of thing.

3. But there is a still more dangerous kind of curiosity—the curiosity concerning evil. It was that curiosity that led Eve astray, and it is the same curiosity that has led men and women, and boys and girls, astray all through the long centuries.

There is a sort of risk and excitement about this curiosity that attracts. People don't want to be bad, but they want to know just a little about badness by experience. They think they are quite able to take care of themselves, and they just want to see how far they can go and come back safely.

Well, I want you to remember two things. First, a great many never come back. Their first taste of evil acts like poison. It is like a match set to a haystack. Soon the whole haystack is in a blaze.

Livingstone tells us about a clever dragon-fly in Africa which catches its prey by appealing to their curiosity. When it is in the grub stage it feeds upon ants and it catches them by putting its head into the ground and waving its tail in the air. The ants come near to examine this strange sight and are immediately seized by the grippers with which the tail is furnished. In the same way a great many people have been ruined just by going to see what evil is like.

And second, those who do return are never quite the same again. You can't touch pitch without having your hands soiled. You can't associate with evil without being a little less pure. If you do come through safely it will nevertheless leave its mark on your mind and your heart and your will, and your most bitter regret all your days may be that you ever had anything to do with it.

God gave us that gift of curiosity, boys and girls, so that we might learn things wise and good and true. Be curious about things that are worthy of your curiosity. Be curious about the highest things. Be curious above all to know more of God and His love, and He will reveal Himself to you and teach you all that it is good for you to know.

The Pearl.

'Goodly pearls.'—Mt 13[45].

The stone usually given to October is the opal, but unfortunately the opal is not mentioned in the Bible, so we shall have to find a gem to take its place. What do you say to the precious stone of the sea—the pearl?

Pearls have always been treasured by man, and a pearl is the very first jewel mentioned in the oldest writings we know. A Chinese dictionary which is over 3000 years old has a word which means 'pearl.' When you come to think of it this is quite natural, for a pearl is a ready-made gem. It doesn't require the cutting that other gems do before they look brilliant. It is lovely without any help of man. In olden days they had not the instruments we have for cutting and polishing precious stones, so they prized the pearl as the queen of gems, and put it at the top of the list.

History tells us that it was because of the pearls which abounded in its rivers that the Romans came to Britain. The Greek name for the pearl was *margarita*. From that we take the name Margaret. So you see there are quite a number of pearls in church to-day.

Long ago people thought that pearls were drops of dew made solid. They said that these drops of dew fell from heaven, but how the dewdrops got into the oyster shell they could not quite explain.

Nowadays we know better. We know that when an oyster or mussel shell is open a little grain of sand floats in. The oyster feels it horribly gritty and uncomfortable, just as we do if we get a particle of something in our eye. And it does what we do in the same circumstances—it sheds a tear. But the oyster's tears are not like ours,—a mixture of salt and water—they are liquid carbonate of lime, and this carbonate of lime hardens into a layer of what is known as *nacre* or *mother-of-pearl*, the same material as that with which the oyster has already lined its shell. The creature is not content with one covering on the top of the grit. It deposits covering after covering till there is a glistening knob fastened to the shell, and you have what is known as a blister pearl.

The perfectly round pearls are made in a slightly different way. It is not a grain of sand but a tiny worm that is the cause of them. This impertinent little worm is floating around in the water looking out for a comfortable home, and when it spies an open shell, in it pops, and immediately begins to bore its way into the poor oyster's body. The oyster's only way to protect itself is to enclose it with pearl, so it sets to work, and by and by you have a perfect round, the most valuable sort of pearl.

The Chinese have taken advantage of this habit of the oyster. They make little flat tin images of

Buddha, open a shell and thrust one in. After a time they open the shell again, and the little tin image is now a shining pearly idol.

The finest pearls are found off the north-west coast of Ceylon, but some lovely specimens come from our own Scotch rivers. The last are mussel pearls, and you can recognize them easily for they have a pinkish-blueish hue very much like the colour of a soft evening sky. You see pearls are not all creamy. There is even a black pearl, but it is very rare. Pearls are of all sizes, from those like a tiny pin-head, known as 'seed' pearls, to the great pearl in the South Kensington Museum in London which measures two inches in length and four and a half round. But it is not size only that counts. Shape and sheen count too. And the sheeniest pearl is the loveliest. That is how the most beautiful pearl in the world is said to be one in the Moscow Museum. It is so exquisitely sheeny that its rival has not been found.

One particularly lovely pearl lies, they say, buried beneath the waters of the canal at Venice; and its story makes us think of Christ's parable of the merchantman and the pearl of great price. This pearl was found in the sixteenth century by a certain Venetian Jew who was a merchant of pearls. He went to the East to look for them, and, after wandering many years and undergoing many dangers, he returned to Venice with a number of fine gems. He sold them all except one pearl of immense size and extraordinary beauty on which he set so high a value that nobody was willing to buy it. Finally he invited all the gem dealers in Venice to meet him on the Rialto. There he offered them for the last time his glorious jewel. The dealers, thinking no doubt that he would lower the price, once more refused to buy. What was their horror and amazement when the Jew turned round and threw the pearl into the canal!—preferring to lose it rather than cheapen it.

The pearl's message seems to me to be as beautiful as itself. I think it says to us, 'Be a pearl-maker.' That is just another way of saying, 'Be a peacemaker.' A peacemaker goes about trying to smooth away all the roughness and the disagreeableness that he meets. You don't need to wait for a quarrel to be a peacemaker. You can be a peacemaker or pearl-maker in so many different ways.

1. *Be a pearl-maker to yourself.*—There are lots of disagreeable tasks and duties that come to us day by day. The oftener we meet them the less we like them. Well, it is no use kicking against them, you have got to do them, and the easiest way is to throw over them a pearly covering of imagination. Say to yourself, 'I'm going to pretend this is the very nicest job in the world.' You will be astonished to find how bearable the hateful duty is in its pearl dress. Try the same plan with your worries. It is as good for them as it is for the disagreeable duties.

2. Then *be a pearl-maker for others.*—Smooth away their difficulties. Cover them with a coating of your pearl solution—that is to say, do what you can to help them out of their troubles.

Be a pearl-maker when you come across a quarrel. Smooth industriously at that quarrel till you have turned it into a pearl of peace and love.

Be a pearl-maker when you hear a nasty story or an unkind word about another boy or girl. Bury that story deep as the oyster buries the worm, under layer after layer. Never let it see the light again. Be like the little girl I read of the other day. As her mother was tucking her into bed at night the comfy way mothers do, the little maid said shyly, 'Mummy, I was a peacemaker to-day.' 'Were you, dear?' said mother. 'Did you settle somebody's quarrel?' 'Oh no!' said the little girl. 'I wasn't that kind of peacemaker, I just knew something and didn't tell.'

Boys and girls, there is nothing finer. Start making pearls this very day.

The Christian Year.

Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity.

A New Light.

'Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is nigh unto Jerusalem, a sabbath day's journey off. And when they were come in, they went up into the upper chamber, where they were abiding; both Peter and John and James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James the son of Alphæus, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas the son of James.'—Acts $1^{12.13}$.

It is not often that farewells are victories; they are more frequently tragedies. But, instead of being a tragedy, the farewell of our Lord was the crowning hour of all He had lived for—the coronation of His work. And as the Cross was nigh unto the city, so the scene of His triumph was within a Sabbath day's journey of Jerusalem,

a distance of not more than three-quarters of a mile.

1. In witnessing the Master's departure, the true meaning of the Incarnation flashed into the disciples' souls. In a moment it all grew real, and true, and beautiful; the men were amazed, and ashamed at not having grasped the idea sooner. Lowly and reverently they bent down and worshipped. No wonder.

The experience sent them home with a new joy in their hearts; and that joy inspired them with a new resolve. They felt they must away back to the city, and communicate the great, glad tidings to the faithful friends awaiting their return. The fact that they determined to go back at once to Jerusalem was proof of their full appreciation of the hopefulness of the situation. For there was undoubtedly great risk in doing so. Had they been disappointed and disheartened with the sudden translation of their Lord to heaven, they might have agreed to disband, and quietly and secretly find their way back to Galilee, as men mindful mostly of their own safety, and half ashamed of the forlorn hope that had ended only in miserable failure and disappointment and desertion. They had still left for themselves a pathway for retreat and return to their old manner of life among the nets and fishing-boats.

But they had come to the parting of the ways. And right nobly and fearlessly they made their choice. Like heroes, they nailed their colours to the mast. They must needs give implicit obedience to the marching orders of their great Commander. Thus they took the step that compelled them to break for ever with their past. The time was when they arose, one after another, and left all and followed Him. They were now to confirm and enhance that great renunciation.

2. When the disciples reached the city, they naturally and instinctively sought the Upper Room. Epiphanius says that when Hadrian came to Jerusalem, he found the Temple desolate and but a few houses standing. This 'little church of God,' however, remained; and Nicephorus says that the Empress Helena enclosed it in her larger church. It was probably the room in which the Supper had been celebrated, and was to be associated with the power of the risen as it had been with the suffering of the humiliated Christ. This upper chamber at Jerusalem, a city in the last days of its troubled existence, contained the whole number of those who acknowledged Christ as their Master. Measured by any worldly standard, anything feebler or more absolutely insignificant than the company gathered there cannot be imagined. But the grain of mustard seed was to become a tree in which the birds of the air should make their nests; the little leaven was to leaven the whole lump; the stone was to become a great mountain which should fill the whole earth. And so it has come to pass that the Upper Chamber at Jerusalem has grown into the Church Catholic, the mother of all the saints that are, or have been, or are to be hereafter.

Were all the kings and emperors, all the men of science and learning, all the poets and artists in the world, to be gathered together in congress, they would never form an assembly so important, so pregnant with reference to the future, and so rich in promise for the progress of the world, as that assembled there.

'The Apostolic band was of every variety of human temperament. Each individual disciple seems to have been the embodiment of some distinctive trait of human character: an incidental proof of our Lord's ability to influence all sorts and conditions of men. St. John was an affectionate man, St. James a practical, St. Peter an impulsive, St. Thomas a critical, St. Matthew a man of business, and St. Simon a political enthusiast. Now, as each of these men came under the influence of our Lord his idiosyncrasies and natural capacities, far from being destroyed or annulled, were guided and directed into wider and deeper channels of usefulness.'

'So to-day, when any man becomes a disciple, Christ does not annihilate his natural capacities, but enlists them in the cause of His Kingdom. The Kingdom of Christ requires every diversity of temperament and talent to contribute to its consolidation and extension. Men of emotion, reflection, action, intellect, all are needed, but not least men of enthusiasm.'[1]

3. The gathering in the Upper Room represented no organization. It was simply a company of men possessed by enthusiasm and conviction. We sadly need enthusiasm in religious things to-day. It is the spirit of a living Church, the crowning feature of Christian character, the paramount requisite for the extension of Christ's Kingdom.

When these sincere and devout men and women came to put the Risen Lord in His rightful place in heaven, then everything else came to fit in and balance itself in true proportion. The Christ on the throne gave a new grandeur to the Christ on the cross. The Divine glory of the Man Christ Jesus dominated their entire conception of His character and mission and work, and so they did

[1] M. G. Archibald, *Sundays at the Royal Military College*, 299, 301.

Him homage, and humbly worshipped Him then and there.

'We talked about our work, and our souls kindled. The weather was very fine. When the shadows of evening were gathering a deep and holy stillness rested on all around us. There was not a human being save our two selves to be seen or heard. We stood, the deeply shadowed hills stretched away on either hand, and then your dear father said, "I feel that I must fall down and worship." It was one of those moments when God was very near to both of us.'[1]

'The Mission was wonderfully blessed of God,' wrote Father Stanton on one occasion to his sister. 'All around about the place they thought it would never succeed, and nobody would ever come to church so many times every day. It is because people never realized that all *love*, all *enthusiasm*, all *devotion*, after all must be centred in GOD and GOD alone, and the preaching of JESUS, however simply, if in earnest, is like a loadstone which draws out souls in what is really a miraculous way.'[2]

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A New Spiritual Force.

'These all with one accord continued stedfastly in prayer, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren.'—Acts 1^{14}.

1. If we can withdraw the curtain, and get a real glimpse into the transactions of those ten wonderful days, we may discover and measure the mighty secret spiritual force that has ruled the world ever since; and learn how it is that frail men like ourselves have been privileged to wield it. For do we not find that they had in hand the work carried on in later days by the monks of Bangor? They had already begun the battle, and were fighting on their knees.

One feels as if it were little short of sacrilege to intrude upon these devoutly exercised worshippers. And yet it forms such an epoch in their religious life, and such a memorable and well-defined landmark in their spiritual history, that great life-lessons for the Church in all times are taught and learnt in the thrilling story of that upper room.

When Ethelred, the Saxon king of Northumberland, invaded Wales, and was about to give battle to the Britons, he observed near the enemy a host of unarmed men. He inquired who they were and what they were doing. He was told they were the monks of Bangor praying for the success of their countrymen. 'Then,' said the heathen prince, 'they have begun the *fight* against us: attack them *first*!'[3]

2. Prayer is action; as action may be itself a prayer. And there are times of waiting for all, when prayer is the only possible action. The transactions between the spirit and God are the most real of all, and are ever followed by significant results. It was social prayer. True prayer requires both solitude at times and at times society. We need the help of one another in the pursuit of truth. Plato spoke of the 'joint striving of souls' in philosophy. Common prayer is the joint striving of souls to lay hold upon the strength of God. 'I will not let thee go, except thou bless me.' It was persevering, continuous prayer, as all exertion of the spirit must be to attain worthy ends. Thus was the mind of the Church calmed, and its intelligence cleared for insight into the business of the kingdom. All great religious movements have commenced in prayer. Little the actors have foreseen of the future.

The confidence of George Fox in the real presence of God was the root of his power in the ministry. Penn tells us that the abruptness and brokenness of his sentences, the uncouthness of some of his expressions, which were 'unfashionable to nice ears,' showed beyond all contradiction that God sent him. But the truest mark of his nearness to God, Penn rightly discerned in the character of his prayers. Fox moved England by prayer.

3. To the company and unanimity of the apostles were added 'the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren.'

A remarkable painting represents Mary, shaken by grief, supported by the beloved disciple, turning away from the cross. In her left hand she holds the crown of thorns. The thought of the painter appears to be that she will retain that coronet of twisted spines as a memorial of the great atonement. But when, after the cross and after the resurrection, we find her in the upper room, she is about to receive a more enduring token of the mighty sacrifice. She awaits the gift of the Spirit, the quivering crown of flame. Henceforward the unbroken course of her life shall be a holy recollection of her Son and Lord, her every deed a due observance of His will, her every thought a radiant remembrance of the Nazarene.

The Mary of myth is a queen, a mediatrix, an object of worship, a hearer of prayer. The Mary of fact is a poor woman, pure and simple, often mistaken, often reproved, though always humble and resigned. She is seen not queening it proudly over others—not presuming anything because of her relation to the Lord Jesus—rather the great divine lessons well learnt, we see Mary, the Mother of Jesus,

[1] *Love and Life: The Story of J. Denholm Brash*, 32.
[2] G. W. E. Russell, *Arthur Stanton: A Memoir*, 80.
[3] J. Morgan, *The Ministry of the Holy Ghost*.

with the brothers and with the women, with all the lowly company of Christ's, '*continuing steadfastly in prayer*'; bowing her great soul humbly before the Throne of God. As the curtain of history rose so it falls on Mary praying. The life of the Mother of Jesus was rounded with prayer. To the last she was the bondmaid of the Lord.[1]

4. It was this continuing in prayer on the part of the apostles, and on the part of the holy women, that led, ten days afterwards, to Pentecost and to the birth of the Church of Christ; and ever is it true that the continuing steadfast in prayer leads to fresh pentecostal gifts, and leads to fresh outpouring of the Spirit, that men and women may do the work to which the Master has called them. Let us continue in that spirit, and the result must be fresh gifts of Pentecost and fresh workers to win the world for Christ.

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Peter as a Leader.

'Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples.'—Acts 1^{15}.

1. The gathering in the Upper Room represented at first no organization. But society without leadership sinks into confusion, and leadership resolves itself into a question of personal qualifications. Men may arise who claim commanding positions who are unable to discharge the duties which their ambition has coveted. In such instances there would seem to be a miscarriage of the natural law and order of things; yet it is only temporary; sooner or later unqualified men have to resign positions which they ought never to have assumed. In a great leader many elements of qualification are combined. Other men may excel him in detached points, but, taken as a whole, he rules not perhaps by one dominant faculty, but by a noble proportion of natural and acquired gifts. The position of a leader is not so easy as it may appear to be to unreflecting observers. Men see the elevation, not the strain and responsibility which that elevation involves. The only sound rule for promotion to influential positions in the Church is, that wisdom, wheresoever found, in the rich or the poor, the old or the young, should be recognized and honoured. These reflexions upon leadership are the more needful and pertinent to the occasion, because some have sought to wrest the action of Peter into a justification of an unauthorized primacy. Peter's action is itself the best answer to such interpretation. Peter did not take the case into his own hands; nor did he claim superiority of judgment, much less infallibility; there is nothing to show that he exalted himself at the expense of the assembled Church. In a simple business-like manner he stated the case which the Church had to consider, and then called upon the whole assembly to come to a conclusion.

It is possible some more phlegmatic disciple in the infant Church may have whispered to his companion, 'How hasty our brother Peter always is!' It would not indeed have been surprising if it had seemed so: Christ's farewell words to His disciples say nothing of any duty which belonged to them between His ascension and the day of Pentecost but this, 'Depart not from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father.' It was a call not to activity, but to stillness and expectancy. But Peter at once organizes a council.[2]

2. It was Peter's very impulsiveness, chastened by prayer, solemnized by his own sad personal experience, deepened by the bitter sorrow consequent on his terrible fall, that urged him to take the first conscious step as the leader of the newly constituted society. How very similar the Peter of the Acts is to the Peter of St. Matthew; what an undesigned evidence of the truth of these records we trace in the picture of St. Peter presented by either narrative! Just as St. Peter was in the Gospels the first to confess at Cæsarea, the first to strike in the garden, the first to fail in the high priest's palace, so was he the first 'to stand up in these days in the midst of the brethren,' and propose the first corporate movement on the Church's part.

For conversion does not change a man's mental characteristics any more than it changes the colour of his skin. 'I am very happy,' said a young theological student in a class-meeting. The wise old man who conducted the class said, 'Yes, you were born happy. You would be happy at a funeral; but it is no proof you are good.' A man's temperament is not changed by grace. It remains the same temperament. Grace works through the stuff out of which the man is made. It does not alter it out of all shape. The temperament is the clay which the potter moulds and shapes to his own purpose; and Peter's blundering, impulsive temperament was not to be crushed, it was to be shaped. God takes men and women as they are. He has created them to glorify Him, and it is out of the stuff He has created that He brings His glory.

[1] J. M. Gibbon.

[2] H. C. Potter, *Sermons of the City*, 250.

It was said of Dr. Bushnell that the more of a Christian he became, the more individual he was. Everything that was characteristic of him flourished in the sunshine of his faith. If Christ was his, everything was his, and, most of all, his living self. His faith also increased his energy. It stimulated his imagination. It gave it form and power. Before his new life of faith, the poet in him was scarcely known to himself. But after his eye was opened to those inspiring realities that engird and penetrate this world of sense, he found himself possessed of a poet's imagery and a poet's fervor. His literary resources were enlarged a hundred-fold by the elevating power of his faith. His faith also increased his joy in nature. It softened his heart towards man. It kindled and sustained his public spirit. It justified his ardent hopefulness in human progress by his faith in the resources that are provided for man in Christ. It stimulated his inventive activity, as it warranted the hopefulness in which his sanguine nature rejoiced. It increased his sympathy with men, and therefore made him more brilliant in conversation and more genial in society.[1]

3. Peter was winning his soul through restraint. He was broken loose and running downhill apace, denying and forswearing his Master; Christ put a restraint upon his spirit by a look. It is so frequently with the saints of God, though in lesser evils. Like as a hawk sitting on a man's hand, eating her food in quietness, is suddenly, by the original wildness of her nature, carried out to an attempt of flying away with all speed, but is checked by the string at her heels, upon which she returns to her meat again, so we have an innate wildness in us, provoking and stirring us up to run from God. Were we not recovered by some clog fastened on us for our restraint, we should often run into the most desperate paths. And this restraint is from the indwelling Spirit. Peter was learning to face things deliberately; on the present occasion he based his arguments on justice. It was not in his nature either to forget his early association with Judas or his own grievous shortcomings when he quoted from the Book of Psalms, the mystical application of which to our Lord and His sufferings he recognizes, selecting passages from the sixty-ninth and the one hundred and ninth Psalms as depicting the sin and the fate of Judas Iscariot, and then sets forth the necessity of filling up the vacancy in the apostolic office.

Doubtless he had many memories of Judas. He could recall the time when the other apostles looked to him with reverence, and were strongly influenced by what he said. He could remember too how the Master chose out Judas Iscariot for a position of responsibility amongst His followers, and the terrible tragedy that followed. Peter had many things with which to reproach himself; to the end of his life he would remember with contrition that threefold denial and threefold absolution. He stood in the Upper Room feeling himself absolutely unworthy. He had been a shuffler—a coward. Yet Christ had said to him, 'Thou art Peter.' As has been said, 'All the empires and the kingdoms have failed because of this inherent and continual weakness, that they were founded by strong men and upon strong men. But this one thing—the historic Christian Church—was founded upon a weak man, and for that reason it is indestructible. For no chain is stronger than its weakest link.'[2]

[1] *Life and Letters of Horace Bushnell*, 199.

[2] Chesterton, *Heretics*.

Twentieth Sunday after Trinity.

Witnesses of the Resurrection.

'Wherefore of these men which have companied with us . . . must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection.'—Acts $1^{21.22}$.

1. How swiftly step follows step, as the redemption wrought by Christ begins its conquering career. On Friday evening the fabric of faith and hope lay shattered in the dust, and they were broken men. But ere the mourners' tears were dry, as the women were bringing spices to anoint the body for burial, the Easter message was declared: 'Why seek ye the living among dead?' and He was among them, breathing peace, bestowing benedictions, allaying fears, saying to them, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost.' And for how short a time, how few, how fitful, and how unexpected were the appearances themselves! The forty days were just the *minimum* to satisfy faith's need, the brief prelude to the giving of the Spirit, and the inauguration of the Church on earth for which creation waited, and for which Christ had lived and died.

Peter spoke as an equal to his equals. He claimed no supreme authority; no authority, in fact, at all, over and beyond what the others possessed. He did not, for instance, on this occasion claim the right as Christ's vicar to nominate an Apostle in the place of Judas. He merely asserted his lawful place in Christ's kingdom as first among a body of equals to suggest to the whole body a course of action which he knew to be in keeping with the Master's wishes, and in fulfilment of His revealed intentions. He laid down the conditions of a possible Apostle: he must have been a witness of all that Jesus had done and taught from the time of His baptism to His ascension. But this qualification alone

would not make a man an Apostle, or qualify him to bear the witness peculiar to the apostolic office. There were evidently numerous such witnesses, but they were not Apostles, and had none of the power and privileges of the Twelve. He must be chosen by his brother Apostles, and their choice must be endorsed by Heaven; and then the chosen witness, who had known the past, could testify to the resurrection in particular, with a weight, authority, and dignity he never possessed before. The apostolic office was the germ out of which the whole Christian ministry was developed, and the apostolic witness was typical of that witness to the resurrection which is not the duty alone, but also the strength and glory of the Christian ministry; for it is only as the ministers and witnesses of a risen and glorified Christ that they differ from the officials of a purely human association.

2. Their office was testimony; and their testimony was to this effect: 'We twelve men knew this Jesus. Some of us knew Him when He was a boy, and lived beside that little village where He was born. We were with Him for three whole years in close contact day and night. We, all of us, though we were cowards, stood afar off with a handful of women when He was crucified. We saw Him dead. We saw His grave. We saw Him living, and we touched Him, and handled Him, and He ate and drank with us, and we, sinners that we are that tell it you, we went out with Him to the top of Olivet, and we saw Him go up into the skies. Do you believe us or do you not? We do not come, in the first place, to preach doctrines. We are not thinkers or moralists. We are plain men, telling a plain story, to the truth of which we pledge our senses. We do not want compliments about our spiritual elevation, or our pure morality. We do not want reverence as possessors of mysterious and exclusive powers. We want you to believe us as honest men, relating what we have seen. There are twelve of us, and there are five hundred at our back, and we have all got the one simple story to tell. It is, indeed, a gospel, a philosophy, a theology, the reconciliation of earth and heaven, the revelation of God to man, and of man to himself, the unveiling of the future world, the basis of hope; but we bring it to you first as a thing that happened upon this earth of ours, which we saw with our eyes, and of which we are the witnesses!'

To that work there can be no successors. Some of them were inspired to be the writers of the authoritative fountains of religious truth, but that gift did not belong to them all, and was not the distinctive possession of the Twelve.

And what do we find in these undeniably and admittedly genuine letters a quarter of a century after the supposed fact? We find in all of them reference to it—the distinct allegation of it. We find in one of them that the Apostle states it as being the substance of his preaching and of his brethren's preaching, that 'Christ died and rose again according to the Scriptures,' and that He was seen by individuals, by multitudes, by a whole five hundred, the greater portion of whom were living and available as witnesses when he wrote.

3. With the resurrection there is mystery. As mystery closes the old dispensation, mystery opens the new. And yet how much there is we can apprehend! We can be witnesses of His resurrection. But you say, How can we be witnesses to that which we did not behold? Well, we witness the resurrection of a tree by the fruit of it; though the tree itself we never beheld. And the witness to the resurrection is to be borne by every one of us. The resurrection life is the life of God in the soul of man. It is not the result of travelling, it is the result of the cogitation of the human mind. It is not the result of social amenities, it is the sacrificial power of God the Holy Ghost, working in the natural souls of men, raising them from death to life, turning them from darkness to light, liberating them from the power of Satan unto God, and enabling them to taste of the freedom with which Christ has made us free.

'Is that the table of your opportunities?' asked Hampden of a respectable well-doing man in Stephen Graham's *Priest of the Ideal*. 'Civilisation has touched you, and, like a caterpillar, you sham death. Why, your opportunities are boundless. Your whole life should be a miracle. You are on the threshold of life; its wonders are all untried. Instead of making a living you can *live*, and instead of finding a calling you can listen for the *call*. Your young heart beats bravely in the midst of the beautiful body; the dweller in the innermost is enthroned in your being; poetry is behind your eyes, the pathos of existence, tenderness unrealised; the majesty of power is on your brow. You are body, but you are also spirit. Nothing can hurt you. You own a God, and you can follow Shadrach, Meshech, and Abednego into the fiery furnace, and it can never consume you. You are proud; there is nobility in your aspect. Yet you are

humble; there is aspiration and yearning in your heart. You *are*. You have also a need to *become*. You were not born to be a slave. About you is a wonderful world of nature beckoning you, enticing you to *become*.

'You need never cast a glance or say a word or touch a person without doing something vital. Each glance or word or touch may be a constraint. Learn to look creatively on men and women and upon things, to say words which change and make, to touch with a touch pregnant with the magnetism of love, with the spirit of love that flows from you to that which you touch.'[1]

[1] Stephen Graham, *Priest of the Ideal*, 352.

William Sanday.

By Francis Crawford Burkitt, F.B.A., D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

The Editor of The Expository Times has asked me to say a few words about Dr. Sanday, on the occasion of his well-won retirement from his Canonry and Professorship at Oxford. Happily this retirement is not caused by illness, but simply by the lapse of time, Dr. Sanday feeling that at the age of seventy-six he can very well leave the labour of teaching to younger men. May he yet be spared to us and to the cause of sound Learning for many days!

I am not going to attempt to make a balanced estimate of the special contribution to knowledge made by Dr. Sanday. It would not, indeed, be appropriate; for we hope we have not yet received the last fruits of his ripe scholarship and erudition. What I have in mind is something much simpler. I want to tell a younger generation of the three occasions on which my studies in the past have been stimulated and helped by Dr. Sanday's work.

1. It is difficult for present-day students to realize how confused and uncertain the study of the Gospels appeared to be thirty and more years ago, when I was an undergraduate. In Old Testament study we were reading Robertson Smith and Wellhausen, and the decisive change of putting the prophets chronologically before the written Law threw a new light over the whole, and showed much of the history of Israel for the first time in its true perspective. But there was little corresponding to this in New Testament study. No clear light seemed to come either from Germany or from our English guides, such as Lightfoot and Westcott. These latter, indeed, seemed more occupied in exposing the crudities of the work called *Supernatural Religion* than in solving the problems which the ancient evidence itself raised. Indeed, these learned guides did not seem (to some of us) really conscious that real problems existed at all. Westcott and Hort never talked of 'the Synoptic Problem,' and Dr. Westcott, in particular, seemed quite satisfied when he had pointed out that each canonical Gospel represented more fully a particular aspect of our Lord's character and mission.

I was dimly conscious that before we were in a position to reconstruct for ourselves, whether on paper or in our own apprehensions, a comprehensible picture of the Gospel History and of its Central Figure it was necessary to tackle a literary problem, that the Canonical Gospels were not independent one of the other, and that the curious aloofness of second-century Church writers (the Apostolic Fathers, I mean, and Justin Martyr) to our Canonical Gospels needed explanation. It was in this state of mind that I came across Dr. Sanday's book, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (Macmillan, 1876), and found it was just what I needed. In form it was even more a controversial work than 'Westcott on the Canon of the N.T.,' for it was written at the request and published at the cost of the Christian Evidence Society, and its sub-title is *An Examination of the Critical Part of a Work entitled 'Supernatural Religion.'* But it was particularly fair in spirit, and, most important of all, it showed everywhere a real appreciation of the literary problems. Much of Dr. Sanday's book is now either old-fashioned, or (more often) his detailed results are treated as almost obvious. But they were not obvious then; indeed, to some of us they were pioneer work in the uncut jungle. I may particularly mention here the remarks on Papias (pp. 145–160), which are a clear and intelligent formulation of the main elements of the literary problem presented by the Synoptic Gospels,

and to the section upon the literary peculiarities of Marcion's Gospel (pp. 222–230), which first showed me the decisive results that can sometimes be obtained from an intelligent use of Bruder's Concordance.

2. The details of Textual Criticism appeal only to a minority, but to me there are few subjects more fascinating than the study of the ancient manuscripts and versions of the Gospels and of the curious groupings of their agreements and disagreements. The immediate aim of the student is not so much to discover the 'original' reading as to map out the history of the transmission of various types of text by means of agreements too close to have been the result of accident. No part of the subject is more complicated or more interesting than that of the Latin versions, nor was any part, when I first came to the study of it, more in confusion. In the earlier editions of Scrivener's *Introduction*, and in the works of scholars of such a different school from his as S. P. Tregelles, we may still read the old view that the original Old-Latin text of the Gospels might be gathered from the codices known as *a*, *b*, and *c*, while another MS. from Bobbio, known as *k*, was supposed to present a revised text. Dr. Hort, on the other hand, had declared that *k* represented the oldest surviving type of Latin text, but to most of us younger students the reasons for this revolutionary opinion were far from clear.

Once again it was Dr. Sanday's researches that for me supplied the guiding ray of light. His 'Further Remarks on the Corbey St. James (*ff*)' in the first volume of the Oxford *Studia Biblica* (1885), was my first introduction to the study of the linguistic characteristics of the African text of the Bible, and this was supplemented in the following year by his illuminating edition of the full text of *k* (*Old-Latin Biblical Texts: No. II.*, Oxford, 1886). I have called it 'his edition,' for though the illustrious names of Wordsworth and White appear on the title-page, it was the essay by Dr. Sanday called 'Relation of *k* to other Old-Latin Texts' (p. xlii ff.), and his two Appendices at the end of the volume, which broke fresh ground and laid the first foundations for a history of the Bible in Latin.

3. The third writing of Dr. Sanday which I want to bring to remembrance here is much more recent, and will be known to most of my readers. When Dr. Sanday came to Cambridge to give some unofficial 'apologetic' lectures to undergraduates in February 1907, he chose for his subject 'The Life of Christ in Recent Research.' He spoke a good deal about Albert Schweitzer, and for myself, and I suppose for many others, the lectures formed a first introduction to the serious study of Eschatology, Jewish and Christian. They drove me at once to Schweitzer's great book, *From Reimarus to Wrede*, which I had then not read, and I did not rest till arrangements were made to have it translated for English readers. Those who read these lines are probably familiar with Mr. W. Montgomery's admirable version of it, called *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. But the value of these lectures of Dr. Sanday's did not consist merely in handing us on to Schweitzer and Wrede and Wellhausen and the other writers whom he notices. There was admirable discriminating criticism as well.

I have now put on record my abiding gratitude to Dr. Sanday, and I shall conclude with a quotation. At the end of his preliminary and suggestive chapter on Symbolism, prefixed to the Cambridge Lectures, he commends a certain attitude of mind. It is so near to the attitude of mind that Dr. Sanday himself has always shown, that the words have a special appropriateness here. 'That attitude,' he says (*Life of Christ in Recent Research*, Oxford, 1907, p. 34), 'consists mainly in three things:

'1. In a spirit of *reverence* for old ideas, which may perhaps be transcended, but which discharged a very important function in their day;

'2. In a spirit of *patience*, which, because those ideas may be transcended, does not at once discard and renounce them, but seeks to extract their full significance;

'3. In an *open mind* for the real extent of this significance. We have our treasure, perhaps, in earthen vessels, but the vessels are themselves very deserving of study. I would say rather that, for the purpose before us, we should not think of them exactly as earthen, but as made of some finer and more transparent material, which permits us to see through to the light within.

'I will venture to add that this attitude is not only right for the particular subject in connexion with which it is suggested, but for all that has to do with the history of Christianity, and indeed for all serious study of Religion.'

Literature.

A BISHOP AND A SOCIALIST.

HERE is a High Church Bishop who speaks disrespectfully of Apostolic Succession. 'I am reading Moberly's book on Apostolic Succession and it is fast destroying every atom of belief I ever had in that doctrine. It seems to me to be a reductio ad absurdum of the theory which it is intended to support. Every argument would be equally valid for the divine right of kings. If the President of the United States is a lawful ruler and called of God, then, by the logic of Mr. Moberly, it would seem to follow that a Congregational minister must also be and vice versa. If the Congregational minister is not a lawful minister then the President of the United States is not a lawful ruler. The book is proof to me that an Englishman is incompetent to write a book on the ministry. He is blinded by the strength and culture and standing of the established Church to the value of Dissent.'

Franklin Spencer Spalding (Macmillan; $2.25) was the son of a Bishop; he was educated at Princetown University under Dr. McCosh; he took his divinity course at the General Theological Seminary of the Episcopal Church in New York; and, after a few years' hard work in a city charge, he was made Bishop of Utah, and sent to live the rest of his short life in Salt Lake City. There he studied Mormonism as few have studied it, and he had the wisdom to study it all round, so that when he lectured on it, as he often did, even the Mormons could find no fault with the lecture.

But the study of Mormonism was a small part of the duties that fell to him. He had to travel day after day over miles upon miles of territory, in all weathers and vehicles. When there was a church he was welcomed by the pastor, when there was none, he gathered the people together as best he could, sometimes going from house to house in the place to find out if there were any left of what had once been an Episcopalian mission, but never daunted or depressed. Truly this was one man who moved breast forward and never doubted clouds would break.

His sympathy was with the employed rather than with the employer. He became a Socialist. And he suffered for it. Once 'the congregation of Churchmen, bankers, lawyers, women, listened spellbound, caught in the torrent of his speech, the terrible earnestness of his manner, the deep religious emotion of his closing appeal. Then the congregation left the cathedral and the storm of criticism broke. "I want this talk about the Church being on the side of the rich stopped," exclaimed one of the most distinguished bishops. "It is not true. Look what the Church is doing for the poor." "Why shouldn't I accept money from the mill owners," said a prominent bishop of a Southern diocese, "for use in the mill town?" "Never have that man in our parish again," exclaimed a sister of a certain rich bishop to her rector. And the rector recalled that a few weeks before the same lady had called Spalding "lovely," and had expressed her desire to have the missionary offering sent to "our own people in the West" rather than to "foreign missions." The wife of one of the prominent lay deputies, a great corporation lawyer, pleaded with Spalding to keep quiet and told him of a rich man who had intended to make a large contribution to a Church hospital in Japan, but now refused to give a cent to a church that tolerated such a bishop. A woman who was a leader in the Woman's Auxiliary and gave away thousands of dollars to missions told him that he would never know how much harm he had done to the missionary work of the Church. The secretary of a certain layman's organization told Spalding that he must stop his socialism, that he was breaking the hearts of his friends, and ruining not only his own reputation but the very Church itself.'

Bishop Spalding hated war—before the Great War was heard of. He would not have the people sing hymns with warlike expressions in them. He changed

> Onward! Christian soldiers,
> Marching as to war,

into

> Onward! Christian workers,
> Labouring for peace,

and made the same retranslation of all the war metaphors in the hymnal.

In September 1914 he was struck by an automobile and instantly killed. 'At the steering wheel was a girl of eighteen years, who bore an

unenviable reputation in Salt Lake as a reckless driver.' He was only 49.

IMMORTALITY.

The Baird Lecture for 1917, now published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark (9s.), deals with *The Idea of Immortality*. The lecturer is the Rev. George Galloway, D.Phil., D.D., Principal and Primarius Professor of Divinity in St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews.

Immortality—it is the most universally urgent problem of the moment. The war has made it so. And in the face of the claims of spiritualism it is the most religiously urgent problem. For spiritualism is in no way a religious movement, and if it takes the place, to any considerable extent, of the Christian belief in a life to come the result for spiritual religion will be disastrous. Dr. Galloway has in this book a singularly convincing estimate of the spiritualistic position at the present time. But his whole book (though he never touches the subject again) is an argument against its essential selfishness.

The idea of Immortality is treated historically. No other method is so effective, or indeed would now be tolerable. For we have accepted the fact that God's revelation is of developing clearness, and that it has developed along the line of actual human experience. To us now a pinch of experience is worth a pound of theory. Not what must be, but what has been and is—that is the argument which comes home to us.

The chapter on Science is the most encouraging chapter in the book. It is undoubtedly a chapter of rejoicing. But the rejoicing has to be tempered with trembling, for there is yet much to be done before the rank and file are won from a practical materialism in respect of death and its issues. The leaders in scientific discovery, and even in scientific teaching, may now be counted upon to disclaim a materialistic interpretation of the Universe. But how many of those who are engaged in the application of science to life have their affections set on things above? Nevertheless it is the most encouraging chapter.

How is the fact of a life beyond death to be brought home to men? Dr. Galloway knows how. It is by 'looking away unto Jesus.' For 'Jesus' own teaching on the life hereafter is marked by deep insight as well as by reserve. On some of the problems connected with the future life he was silent or said little. But on the fact that human existence was not annihilated by death he spoke with perfect confidence and with unerring discernment he brought the hope of a blessed immortality into living relation with the character of God. So far as the sources of his teaching on the subject are to be found outside himself, they are to be traced to passages in the Old Testament and to Apocalyptic Literature. But in a greater degree they rest on his own unique consciousness of God and his profound experience of spiritual communion with Him. In the light of this experience he taught the value of the individual and the infinite possibilities of human life. The gain of the whole world will not compensate for the loss of the soul. This conception of the value of personality stands in the closest relation to the conception of God in the Gospel of Christ. God is the Father of men; He loves and cares for His earthly children, and will not give them a stone for bread. He knows all their needs. That this intimate fellowship should be destroyed by death is not conceivable: for God, as Jesus declared, "is not the God of the dead but of the living," and "all live unto Him." The life of God in man cannot be extinguished by the dissolution of the material organism. The communion of the human soul with God is the fulfilment of the divine purpose, and a fact of supreme value: the conservation of this value is a just expectation which is based on the character of God. As has been remarked, Jesus raises one idea of humanity so that its immortality naturally follows.'

Enough. Many years ago Messrs. T. & T. Clark had the satisfaction of being the publishers of Professor Salmond's book on the *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*. Its success was what is called phenomenal. Principal Galloway's book is up to date. It is at least as great.

KOHELETH.

A Gentle Cynic, being a Translation of the Book of Koheleth commonly known as Ecclesiastes stripped of later Additions, also its Origin, Growth, and Interpretation; by Morris Jastrow, jr., Ph.D., LL.D., Professor in the University of Pennsylvania (Lippincott; 9s. net). That is the title-page of a most attractive, modern, and highly scientific introduction to the Book of Ecclesiastes.

It is more than an introduction, though the introduction is a great and valuable part of it. Dr. Jastrow gives us also the Book of Ecclesiastes shorn of its later additions, and even these later additions themselves in three separate appendixes. For he believes that this book of the Bible has been revised and improved (chiefly in the interests of orthodoxy) by many subsequent hands, and now it is so different from the book which Koheleth wrote that he would have been likely, had he lived to see it as we see it, to repudiate it as utterly foreign to its original intention. 'Critical scholarship, as the result of the combined activity of many scholars of many lands during the past century, now recognizes that the book, as it stands in our Bible, consists of a kernel to which liberal additions have been made. These additions which were introduced, as we shall see, for the express purpose of counteracting the effect of Koheleth's unconventional views and to give a more orthodox turn to his thought are to be found in each one of the twelve chapters into which the book was arbitrarily divided. In some chapters, the additions consist merely of a phrase or of a sentence skillfully inserted here and there at a critical point in the discussion; in others, as in the eighth chapter, the additions are almost equal to the original section, while again in some, as in the seventh and tenth chapters, the supplementary material is in excess of the original portion of the chapter. Besides these conspicuous additions, amounting in all to more than one-fourth of the book, there are little glosses and comments of a miscellaneous character, likewise interspersed throughout, which correspond to our foot-notes to a text.'

The additions are of three kinds. Some were made by 'pious' commentators in the interest of Jewish orthodoxy; some are by 'maxim' commentators, being the insertion of current proverbial sayings largely in the same interest; the rest are miscellaneous comments and glosses.

Who was the original author? 'Koheleth,' says Dr. Morris Jastrow, 'lived at a time when the author had begun to be a factor in the intellectual and social life, but still could hide himself under a *nom de plume* and reap an advantage from so doing. For Koheleth *is* a disguise, and it is reasonable to suppose that in describing himself as a king over Jerusalem, who had amassed wealth, who possessed great power, and who was also "wiser than all who were before me in Jerusalem" (i. 16), he aimed to identify himself with Solomon whose name must, therefore, have already become at the time when Koheleth wrote a synonym for wisdom, glory and power. The device was successful. An uncritical tradition, accepting the implication in the disguise, attributed the book to Solomon. The magic of this name went a large way towards overcoming the objections that later arose against its inclusion in the canon because of its heterodox spirit and contents. The name Koheleth thus furnishes an instance of real pseudepigraphy among the Jews. We may acquit the author of any desire to deceive his readers, and he certainly did not look forward to having his book included in a sacred collection, but apart from the hope which may have tickled his vanity of increasing both the popularity and the influence of his book by creating the impression that he was speaking in the name of the wise and glorious king, he may have been actuated in adopting a *nom de plume* by the fear of risking a personal unpopularity through his identification with the teachings which he set forth in such bold fashion. The author may not have been of the stuff of which martyrs are made. Authors rarely are. He would, at all events, have been condemned by the pious and the orthodox, and his book, after creating a mild sensation, would probably have been consigned to oblivion. Instead of being included in a sacred collection, it might have been placed on an *Index Librorum prohibitorum*, and the world would have been the poorer for the loss. We should, therefore, be grateful for the device which he adopted as well as for its complete success, indicated by the heading at the beginning of the book, which was subsequently added, and in which the words "son of David" were included so as to remove all doubt of the identification of Koheleth with the famous king.'

That 'Koheleth' is a disguise is proved by the fact that it is a feminine noun, and represents a formation in Hebrew which could not be used as the name of an individual.

JEREMIAH.

The new volume of 'The Westminster Commentaries,' edited by Dr. Walter Lock, is *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*, with introduction and notes by L. Elliott Binns, M.A., late Chaplain

and Lecturer in Old Testament History, Ridley Hall, Cambridge (Methuen; 16s. net).

Mr. Binns reminds us that Jeremiah is the longest book in the Bible. And so he is entitled to the largest volume of the series. No doubt he could have taken still more space if it could have been allowed him. But he has used it well.

In the introduction he deals with (1) the Importance of Jeremiah; (2) the Times of Jeremiah; (3) the Life of Jeremiah; (4) the Character of Jeremiah; (5) the Teaching of Jeremiah; (6) the Book of Jeremiah; (7) the Style of Jeremiah; (8) the Influence of Jeremiah.

He discovers three outstanding traits in the character of Jeremiah.

(1) *His timidity.* 'The call of Jeremiah,' he says, 'is the first event narrated in the book which bears his name, and it is a record of the spirit in which the prophet carried out his whole life-work. Great self-distrust and inward fear overcome by the power of God are the marks of Jeremiah's ministry. He did not like Isaiah volunteer to go on God's errand, but like Moses he shrank back from it. God gave him power by touching his lips, and then commanded him to speak out all the words which had been given him, otherwise his cowardice would be openly shown in the sight of his enemies. There can have been few men in the history of the world who have undertaken tasks less congenial to them than did Jeremiah when he became the prophet of Jehovah; the weakness of his nature made his life one long perpetual struggle, he cursed the day on which he was born, and even rose to the height of blaming God Himself. His timid spirit and the extremity of suffering which he had to undergo drove him almost to madness; hence his strange boldness towards God. He felt that it was for His sake that he had borne reproach, and that God, as it were, had forced him against his own will to undertake the life of pain which oppressed him, and at times threatened to overwhelm him. These strange outbursts are the strongest possible evidence of the desperate state to which the prophet had been reduced, a state of despair such as comes to "many a lofty soul which feels itself misunderstood by man, which can hardly believe that it is not deserted by God."'

(2) *His power of endurance.* Here Mr. Binns quotes Dr. Payne Smith: 'Naturally despondent and self-distrustful, there was no feebleness in his character; and he possessed a far higher quality than physical courage in his power of patient endurance.' And then, he says, 'the secret of his courage and endurance was to be found in the God who had called him to His service, and whose promise of continual help never failed him. At the same time the Divine power acted as a compelling as well as a helping force. The prophet was decidedly not one of those who from the desire for publicity or fame preach startling sermons, and his shrinking and retiring nature needed the stimulus of God's awful compulsion before the proclamation of his message was possible. Newman's description of the steadfastness of the Christian might well be applied to Jeremiah. "The foundations of the ocean," he says, "the vast realms of water which girdle the earth, are as tranquil and as silent in the storm as in the calm. So it is with the souls of holy men. They have a well of peace springing up within them unfathomable; and though the accidents of the hour may make them seem agitated, yet in their hearts they are not so."'

(3) *His sensitiveness.* 'Jeremiah has come down to later ages as the "weeping prophet," mainly it may be supposed because the book of Lamentations was traditionally attributed to him, and his name has been turned into a byword for pessimistic denunciations. But Jeremiah's denunciations were no more severe than those of the other prophets, his outlook on the future no darker. Why then was it that he above all other prophets should be chosen out to bear the term of reproach? It is almost undoubtedly for two reasons amongst others. (i.) The soul of Jeremiah, with the possible exception of Hosea, was more sensitive than that of the others. He was not one who heard the deep sighing of the poor, and left it unheeded, rather was he one of that noble but suffering band

> "to whom the miseries of the world
> Are misery, and will not let them rest."

It is true that to him as to them all there came times when (to continue the quotation) he did desire to "find a haven," not indeed "in the world" but rather from it. This longing, due to natural reaction in one of a highly strung and sensitive nature, is evidence of the extremity of his suffering rather than of his desire to avoid responsibility,

and was soon put aside and no doubt repented of with tears. (ii.) Just as Jeremiah felt the miseries of the individual Israelites, so he felt the horrors of the fate which was coming upon the nation at large. His naturally affectionate disposition, cut off from the love of wife or child, poured itself out in overflowing measure upon his country. Isaiah or Ezekiel could utter the most scathing condemnations of Israel or Judah, could forecast for them the most desperate fortunes, and apparently remain unaffected themselves; but such was not the case with Jeremiah, he was no mere "looker on of this world's stage," and the sorrows of the nation were as his own, its hopeless and pitiable fate moved him till, as he himself said, his eyes became "fountains of water."'

Let that suffice for a knowledge of the introduction. Come now to the notes. There is an additional note on 'Jeremiah and Nature.' It occurs in connexion with the vision of the rod of an almond tree (1^{11}). In that note Mr. Binns shows that Jeremiah, being unable to differentiate between God and the laws by which He acts, was led in some cases, as were other prophets, to a belief in doctrines which to the mind of a later and more enlightened age seem to be distinctly dangerous. As an example he gives the doctrine that the sins of parents might be visited on their children by a deliberate interference of God to that end. He points out that Jeremiah had a much greater appreciation of the more tender aspects of nature than the other prophets of Israel. 'He was evidently a close observer of bird life, and several times refers to the flight of birds across the heavens; he admired their wonderful instinct (viii. 7), he had watched their habits closely (xii. 9), and his interest followed them even into their captivity (v. 27); at the same time he seems to have had no ear for the music of their song (cf. Cant. ii. 12). Nor did the wider aspects of Nature leave Jeremiah untouched, and he was ever alive to the changing march of the seasons. Yet with all this appreciation of the softer and gentler moods of Nature there was something that was grim and harsh, and the predominant impression left on our minds by the imagery of the book is one of tumult and horror. Descriptions of the sea dashing and raging against its bounds, of the mountains and hills rocking in the throes of a mighty earthquake, of the whole land desolate, seem more akin to the mind of Jeremiah than the soothing picture of the budding almond tree and the silent approach of spring.'

SOCIAL PROGRESS.

We used to hear much about growth in grace. It was one of the great pulpit themes. For there was a certain subtle flattery in it that secured a respectful attention, and it was easy to handle, the Scripture reference being abundant. What is the preacher to do when the idea of growth in grace has become old-fashioned and out of date? He must proclaim social progress, must he not? Which is a very different thing.

For social progress need not be due to Christ. It need not be even a religious thing. None preach social progress more heartily than the secularists. They preach it as an antidote to the poison of Christianity. They preach it in order to make the cross of Christ of none effect.

Mr. Arthur James Todd, who is Professor of Sociology in the University of Minnesota, has made 'a critical study of the attempts to formulate the conditions of human advance,' and has called the volume which expresses his results *Theories of Social Progress* (Macmillan). He does not write as an opponent of Christianity. He does not write as a Christian. The question of Religion as a factor in social progress occupies one chapter, and is discussed with what is called scientific impartiality. You could not tell for certain at the end of it whether Religion helps or hinders. It is evident that social progress is not an end to the preacher of Christ and Him crucified. The preacher's end is the Kingdom of God, but Professor Todd does not look forward to that as the goal of human advancement.

Social progress means (to Professor Todd) three things, and these three together: first, a change on the part of man from passive to active adaptation, that is to say, from merely fitting into his natural environment to utilization and control of it; next, greater sharpness and breadth of intellectual perceptions; and thirdly, a keener sense of moral relations. Is there a God anywhere about? Perhaps there is, says Professor Todd. 'Perhaps there is even a Prime Mover who communicates the eternal impulse to improve. But we have no tangible evidence of him in this capacity. Such a Power may be assumed pragmatically, but at present is beyond the scientific ken.'

THE AMORITES.

Though the Jerahmeelites have not survived their discovery by Professor Cheyne, the Amorites, discovered about the same time or a little later, and chiefly by Professor Albert T. Clay of Yale University, are very much alive. They are as much alive as the Hittites, and cover almost as great a territory. We are familiar with the empire of the Hittites: we must become familiar with *The Empire of the Amorites*. Professor Clay tells us all about it in the book he has called by that name (Yale University Press), a handsome volume such as the Universities of America can produce 'regardless of expense.'

The Amorites are better worth knowing than even the Hittites. For they had a closer relation to the Israelites. Professor Clay believes that it is to them and not to the Babylonians that the Hebrews owed their civilization. And he gives reasons enough to persuade the unprejudiced. But unfortunately there is some prejudice here. The Babylonian influence has been bound up with astral theories—Samson, a sun-god; Joshua, Gideon, Saul, David, all solar or lunar deities of the Babylonians—so that it is not a matter now of mere historical research. It is clear enough, however, that we must let all that go. It had already begun to overbalance itself. 'Zimmern found that elements of the Marduk cult were applied to Christ; even his death was suggested by that of Marduk and Tammuz. But the most extreme of all was Jensen, who found that all the Biblical characters, from Abram to Christ, even including John the Baptist, were simply borrowed from Babylonian sun-myths.' Professor Clay has given it the needful push. Now we shall look for light on Hebrew origins to the nearer Amorites.

SCOTTISH LITERATURE.

Mr. George Gregory Smith, LL.D., Professor of English Literature in the University of Belfast, has the gift of style, and the gift of style is always irresistible. Clearly he might write on any subject, *quicquid agunt homines*, and we should read him. Here and now he writes on *Scottish Literature: Character and Influence* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net). It is to him a great enough subject to make a great book of. To the ordinary half-educated Englishman it does not exist—well, except for Burns, and 'Burns! really now, you know.' Professor Smith has recalled some Englishmen's criticisms of Burns—and not even half-educated Englishmen. Their charge is provincialism:

'When Matthew Arnold, in his Introduction to a popular anthology of the English Poets, made survey from his trigonometric base of "criticism of life," he took particular care to check some Scottish miscalculations of Burns's genius. He found much that was reasonable in the general estimate, but he thought the verse has too often the taint of the provincial and local. It "deals perpetually with Scotch drink, Scotch religion, and Scotch manners"—so we are told, four times in one paragraph. If it have "truth of matter and truth of manner," it lacks the "high seriousness," the "accent or the poetic virtue of the highest masters." Ruskin, in the same year, when referring to the fourth stanza of *Death and Dr. Hornbook*, concluded that "for Burns the moon must rise over Cumnock hills," and Henley, in the calm of a footnote to a famous effort in frankness (1896), held that most of the poems are local, "parochial even"; that in *Holy Willie* and the *Holy Fair*, for example, "the circumstances, the manners, the characters, the experience, all are local." Such agreement by three English critics must command respectful consideration, for on all questions as to how the universal appeal of an artist is affected by the parochial and petty, the alien has perhaps the better right to speak. Yet it is strange that they should have found this disturbing element in Burns, who, of all poets, has laid hold of the universal, and, in winning the world's favour, has overcome the barrier of dialect. Arnold's position was soon attacked and turned, and it is not necessary to add much to what the late Professor Nichol said in his *Life* of the poet about the critic's confounding of "provincialism in themes and provincialism in thought." If "provincialism" means anything, it is, as our Oxford authority has it, "narrowness of view, thought, or interests, roughness of speech or manners, as distinct from the polish of court or capital." The roughness of speech, that is the dialect, has been condoned, even allowed to be an aid where the curial speech must fail. Of narrowness of view, even Matthew Arnold would have made no complaint. What he appears to hint at is the studied and unflagging realism of Burns's work, the absence of the abstract and of the mist of romance. This is an unexpected mis-

liking on the part of one to whom, both as poet and critic, classicism meant so much. For, as one has laid it down, "Romance . . . there was none in Burns—'tis the sole point, perhaps, at which he was out of touch with the unrenowned generations whose flower and crown he was." His is that classical quality, the perfection of the acquisitive power which misses nothing, feels directly and fully, and, as in the greater of the ancients, attains the absolute by its very precision in the real. The moon may rise over Cumnock and cast familiar shadows of Ayrshire lairds and weavers. What of that? If Afton Water were to meander by Parnassus, and Alloway Kirk were a temple of the Great God Pan, we should be not one whit less distracted—we might be more—than we are by the transcendent realism of this modern.'

That is a taste of Professor Smith as well as of Burns.

Professor Smith finds two moods in the literature of Scotland. There is the realistic mood, the sense of actuality, grip of fact, and entrance into much 'trivial' detail. 'What we are really thinking of is "intimacy" of style. Scottish literature has no monopoly of this, which is to be found in the best work everywhere, and is indeed a first axiom of artistic method, no matter what processes of selection and recollection may follow; but in Scots the zest for handling a multitude of details rather than for seeking broad effects by suggestion is very persistent.'

The other mood is very much otherwise. The Scottish Muse, 'though she has loved reality, sometimes to maudlin affection for the commonplace, has loved not less the airier pleasure to be found in the confusion of the senses, in the fun of things thrown topsyturvy, in the horns of elfland and the voices of the mountains.'

'It is a strange union of opposites, alien as Hotspur and Glendower; not to be explained as if this liking for "skimble-skamble stuff" were derived from the very exuberance of the poets' realism by an inevitable reaction, or were a defect of its quality, or a sort of saturnalian indulgence to the slaves of observation.' 'The Scot is not a quarrelsome man, but he has a fine sense of the value of provocation, and in the clash of things and words has often found a spiritual tonic. Does any other man combine so strangely the severe and tender in his character, or forgo the victory of the most relentless logic at the sudden bidding of sentiment or superstition? Does literature anywhere, of this small compass, show such a mixture of contraries as his in outlook, subject, and method; real life and romance, everyday fact and the supernatural, things holy and things profane, gentle and simple, convention and "cantrip," thistles and thistledown?'

ANIMAL AND HUMAN.

The old Roman's boast, *nihil humanum a me alienum puto*, is too narrow now. We must take in the animals. We cannot make progress without carefully considering them, and especially the infinitesimally small and invisible individuals of them. Mr. Arthur Dendy, D.Sc., F.R.S., Fellow of King's College and Professor of Zoology in the University of London, has edited a volume of papers on *Animal Life and Human Progress* (Constable; 10s. 6d. net).

It is quite probable that to a multitude of readers the book will be a revelation of interdependence between the animals and man, and of more than interdependence, of genuine solidarity. Professor F. Wood Jones tells us that we owe our existence to them—not to the very apes you see in the Zoological Gardens, but to certain predecessors of them and us. And then Dr. R. T. Leiper proves that they are with us still. His title is 'Some Inhabitants of Man and their Migrations.'

But the essay that has attracted us most is the fourth in the volume. Its author is Professor J. Arthur Thomson of the University of Aberdeen. Its title is 'Man and the Web of Life.' For the very purpose of this essay is to show that we—animals and men, and all things else in this wonderful Universe—are all bound together in the bundle (or as the more scientific word is 'the web') of life. We cannot isolate ourselves. We cannot sever our connexion with our fellow-men without grievous moral and intellectual loss—that we know. But also we cannot cut off the strands that connect us with the universe of being without serious loss and even certain disaster—physical, mental, moral—and that too not to ourselves only but to the rest of the web.

Who wove this amazing web of life? Professor Arthur Thomson knows that he did not do it, nor any other man, nor any other animal. And he has no hesitation in finding an outside Artifex; who is also not outside, but ever weaving, weaving, weaving the web of life from within, weaving it so

certainly from within that He shares in the sorrow that comes when any part of it is shattered by thoughtless sinfulness. This is not a religious book. But the science of the capable men of to-day is scientific Christianity.

Mr. Samuel Proudfoot has had a striking spiritual experience, some account of which he gives in the preface to his book entitled '*All Too Human?*' (Brown & Sons; 4s. 6d. net). From admiration of the Tractarian Movement he passed to Maurice and the Christian Socialists, and thence to Father Tyrrell. Now his faith is 'Sacramental, it is Social, and it is part and parcel of Man and of his development here on earth. I believe in humanity, and (though I am no Comtist) in his essential divinity as redeemed, renovated, and inspired by Christ. Without Him and without that Revelation of God which His life gave, mankind is poor, miserable and weak; his aims alike petty and disastrous. Without Christ I were a pessimist, but in Him my optimism is triumphant.'

The volume contains a frank criticism of prevalent teaching, without respect of person or church. But there is neither conceit nor contempt in the criticism. If organized Christianity has failed, Mr. Proudfoot feels that he has contributed to the failure. There are, however, great facts that stand sure, the Incarnation, the Sacraments, the forgiveness of Sin, the power of Prayer, and the offer of Eternal Life. Let these facts find way with us and all will yet be well. The last chapter, which could have come first, is on the Reunion of the Churches. If all were as this English vicar reunion would be very near.

Professor George Herbert Palmer of Harvard is known to us as a preacher—a preacher of short sermons that sometimes satisfy and sometimes not but always make us think. Now he appears as a critic of poetry. He has published some lectures on *Formative Types in English Poetry* (Constable; 7s. 6d. net). He has chosen seven English poets as types of English poetry, but not merely as types, as masters who made scholars after their own likeness. And thus he has written in a sense a history of the evolution of English poetry, as the omnipresent scientist would say. His poets are—how would you guess?—Chaucer, Spenser, Herbert, Pope, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning.

But what is Poetry? Yes, that is the first question. And Professor Palmer answers it as honestly as any man. Poetry, he says, is 'the conscious transmission of an emotional experience to another imaginative mind.' It is a definition worth making a note of.

The next question is, What is the use of it? Professor Palmer gives an honest answer again. Its most considerable use, he says, comes from its work in training the imagination. 'Poetry offers us our best opportunity for entering into experiences not our own. It thus corrects our tendency to become shut up within our separate selves. People differ widely in understanding the life of others. Some, of imagination all compact, know instinctively the moods of those whom they approach. Others seem incapable of comprehending any other minds than their own. And how petty, tactless, isolated, and poverty-stricken are such lives! We are social beings. Each life naturally interlocked with that of others, suffers depression when detached. Swift mutual understanding brings pleasure and efficiency. Because poetry can train us in a habit of mind so generous, it has high social value.'

Mr. Ozora S. Davis is convinced that the most urgent demand made upon a preacher of to-day is for adaptation. He must make his sermons suit the new circumstances. For the war has caused a complete cleavage in men's thoughts of God and the world. The congregations that we preach to now may outwardly seem to be the same as those we preached to before the war, but they are not the same. They are wholly different. They differ in mind and memory. They differ in their attitude to the gospel and to life. He has therefore written a book for the sole and simple purpose of showing the preacher of to-day how to adapt himself to his new audience. He has great faith in preaching. He promises a great future for it. But always on the understanding that the preacher gives his mind to adaptation.

Mr. Davis in a series of chapters considers such circumstances as are likely to arise in every preacher's sphere of influence, shows how new they are, and how to encounter their novelty. At the end of every chapter he quotes appropriate texts, and makes suggestions for their appropriate treatment. The preacher has to preach, for example, on Patriotism. If he ever preached on

Patriotism before it will be different preaching now. The atrocities of the Germans, and the brutalities of the Turks, have wrought the difference. What texts are there? He chooses Neh 2^{3}, Gn 24^{6-8}, Gn 14^{23}, Is 63^{5}, Phil 1^{27}, Jg $5^{15.16}$, Is 6^{8}, Phil 2^{15}, Lk 20^{25}.

The book is published at the University of Chicago Press, and in this country at the Cambridge University Press. Its title is *The Gospel in the Light of the Great War* ($1.25 net).

The writer of *The Land of Promise* (Church Missionary Society; 2s.) admits that of the making of books about Palestine there is no end. But he is right in claiming attention for his own book. For it is neither a collection of travellers' tales nor a course of lectures delivered before a geographical society. It is a missionary's message. It is an earnest declaration of the opportunity that is offered for the entrance of Christianity into Palestine, and of the conditions of life, so favourable for the reception of the gospel, to be found there. A greater theme no man could have in the writing of a book, and the Rev. H. G. Harding recognizes both the greatness and the urgency of it.

Why is it that American sermons to children are so much more American than American sermons to adults? No doubt there are preachers to adults in America who are consumedly American. Take Banks or Burrell for examples. But the great American preachers are as British as they are American and for that matter as French or German, were it not for the language they use. But you never read a sermon to American children that was not American first and last and all the way. The language is American, so American that it is sometimes almost unintelligible. The anecdotes are American, so American as sometimes to be almost incredible. You would think that the very Bible which the preacher has in his hand is an American Bible, so utterly American are the quotations which he makes from it.

If, therefore, you are an American preacher preaching to American children, get hold of one of the best books for your purpose, *Morning Faces*, by the Rev. George McPherson Hunter (New York: Doran; $1.25 net). But if not you had better leave it alone—unless, of course, you have lost your children's attention and think that the time has come to try an experiment and make a sensation.

The Oxford Souvenir Edition of *The Holy Bible with Central Column References* is worthy of the workmanship of the Oxford University Press, and it is a worthy memorial of the Peace celebrations. It is bound, we suppose, in a variety of leathers. The volume sent us for notice is inexpensively but attractively bound in dark red. In the centre as it lies right side up on the table there is a cleverly cut Peace device and round the outside are engraved the words, 'The Lord will bless His people with peace.'

Two volumes have been written by Professor Henry J. Cadbury of Haverford College on *The Style and Literary Method of Luke.* The first volume is published. It deals with the diction of the Third Gospel and the Acts (London: Milford; $1.25). It contains three essays, one on the size of Luke's vocabulary, one on the literary standard of the vocabulary, and one on the alleged medical language of Luke.

Observe the word 'alleged.' 'In the year 1882, W. K. Hobart published under the title "The Medical Language of St. Luke," an elaborate investigation into the vocabulary of Luke, aiming to show, mainly by quoting parallels from medical writers, that the language of the third Evangelist has a distinctly medical tinge. Some attempts in the same direction had been made before Hobart, though he was acquainted with only one, an article that appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for June 1841. To the large mass of material which Hobart collected no additions seem to have been made since, though Zahn and Harnack have greatly strengthened the argument by selecting from Hobart only the most convincing examples.'

To Zahn and Harnack add Moffatt. And then to these three, who have together strengthened Hobart's argument, add almost all the English New Testament scholars as believers in it.

But Professor Cadbury does not believe in it. 'The style of Luke,' he says (after a long and searching investigation), 'bears no more evidence of medical training and interest than does the language of other writers who were not physicians.'

The volume is published as one of the Harvard Theological Studies, and an editorial note is added to Professor Cadbury's essay signed by Professor

G. F. Moore. 'The earlier discussion,' says Professor Moore, 'turned on the question whether "Luke the physician" (Col 4^{14}) was the same Luke to whom tradition ascribed the third Gospel and the Acts (Iren., Euseb., Jerome), or, as Erasmus, Calvin, and others surmised, another person, expressly distinguished from the Evangelist by the designation "the physician."' He then gives a history of the discussion, and on the whole, though he is not very clear about it, seems inclined to throw in his lot with Professor Cadbury.

A book on *The Problem of Gambling* has been written by Mr. E. Benson Perkins (Epworth Press; 2s. net). It contains an account of the law relating to gambling, written by Dr. F. G. Neave. Every expression of the gambling mania is dealt with, and all capably and quietly. But the revelation is only the more awful that it is made without mysteries. It is a book to be circulated by the thousand.

There is no argument for Immortality like the conscientious conviction of a good man. The intellectual arguments are many, but they leave us cold and uncomfortable. 'Your letter,' said a mourning father, near the end of the war, 'gave me real help and most of all that you yourself believe.' And when that argument is enforced by beautiful writing, as is the case with a book entitled *The Dream that Comes True* (Epworth Press; 5s. net), it is almost irresistible. Mr. J. Napier Milne, the author of it, has just that feeling for the virtue of language which gives it power with us. He is evidently a careful student of the Bible also. But, as has been said, it is his own conviction that convinces us. He dreams and he believes he dreams truly. We also dream and he greatly helps us to believe.

What comfort have you been able to offer to those who have been bereaved by the war? The Rev. H. E. Maddox, B.D., knows no comfort higher or better than an encouragement to look for *The Promise of His Coming*. But he knows very well that this is comfort only for those who love His appearing. And so it is to them that he addresses the book which he has published under that title (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d. net). Although Mr. Maddox calls his book 'The Promise of His Coming' he is careful to point out that he does not rely upon a merely verbal promise contained in such and such passages of Scripture, passages which might be explained away, or given a variety of interpretations. It is bound up with the whole scheme of man's redemption and the restoration of the creation.

We fear that the immediate occasion for the volume entitled *Sermons for the Peace Celebrations* (Skeffington; 3s. 6d. net) has passed. But if we are no longer engaged in public celebrations, the necessity of doing everything in our power to maintain peace is upon us still, and will be upon us for many years to come. Let the preacher take these simple earnest sermons as models of the kind of preaching that he must persist in. They are by various clergymen of the Church of England, including Canon Ivens and the Rev. J. A. Craigie.

Two additions have been made to the 'Handbooks of Christian Literature' published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The one is a brief, clear, reliable account of *The Early Christian Books*, by the Rev. W. J. Ferrar, M.A. (3s. 6d. net). The other is a statement and defence of the doctrine of *The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture*, by the Rev. G. D. Barry, B.D. (4s. 6d. net).

What does Mr. Barry understand by Inspiration? For on that will depend the usefulness of his book. He leaves one in no doubt. 'It may be stated at once,' he says, 'that the central word in which the belief in the paramount authority of Holy Scripture is expressed, occurs only once in the New Testament: and in that passage St. Paul is simply giving a definition of the purpose which "Inspired Scripture" may rightly be expected to fulfil; he is not telling us which Books, in his judgement, are Inspired Scriptures and which are not. One other statement tells us the originating source which gave birth to the Books of the Bible: "Men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." In these words lies the key to the deeper meaning of inspiration: the writers wrote because they were under the influence and teaching of the Holy Ghost, but it is distinctly implied that their human powers were not suspended: they delivered their message each in his own characteristic way. The inspired writer absorbs into himself what has been given to him from above, and then gives it out with his own lips and in his own language. "The

supernatural fertilises and does not annihilate the natural," the individuality of the author is allowed full expression.'

The object of the book is to show that such a doctrine of Scripture as that is the doctrine of the Church. It gives the witness from the Apostolic Fathers to Augustine.

The S.P.C.K. has a series of Rabbinic Texts under translation. The *Tractate Sanhedrin*, containing the judicial procedure of the Jews as codified towards the end of the second century A.D., has been translated from the Hebrew, with Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. Herbert Danby, M.A., Sub-warden of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden (6s. net).

The Rev. A. C. Bouquet, B.D., calls his book *The Greatest Relationship* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net in cloth, 1s. net in paper). What is the greatest relationship? It is the relation between man and God called Religion. This book is an argument for the knowledge of God addressed to the average Englishman, and it is an effective one. For Mr. Bouquet has clear ideas, and he has the imagination to set himself beside his reader, talking pleasantly and persuasively. In these times of stress so fair and sympathetic a writer should be widely read.

Can theology be progressive while the faith remains unchanged? That question is answered by the Rev. Charles Harris, D.D., in a paper read at Christ Church, Oxford, and now published by the S.P.C.K. under the title of *The Creeds and Modern Thought* (2s. net).

What is modern thought? Dr. Harris finds four main tendencies in modern thought which distinguished it from ancient and still more from mediæval thought: (1) a tendency to question authority; (2) the use of observation and experiment; (3) the interpretation of the universe in terms of evolution; (4) the rejection of the supernatural.

Dr. Harris believes that all these tendencies can be respected while the dogmas of the creed are accepted in all their essential meaning. He reckons himself a modern thinker, yet he believes in the Virgin Birth, the Descent into Hell, and the Ascension.

The latest issue of the 'S.P.C.K. Texts for Students' is a small volume of *Select Extracts from Chronicles and Records relating to English Towns in the Middle Ages* (9d. net). The volume is edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by F. J. C. Hearnshaw, M.A., LL.D.

Hitherto we have had to find the volume containing *The Pilgrimage of Etheria* in the Palestine Text Society's scarce series. Now an edition is issued by the S.P.C.K., edited by the late Mrs. McClure and Dr. C. L. Feltoe (6s. net). And good as Dr. J. H. Bernard's edition was, this is better. For it incorporates all, or nearly all, that scholarship has had to say since Signor Gamurrini discovered the book in a Manuscript of the eleventh century at Arezzo, and it has the benefit of the revision or suggestion of Archbishop Bernard, Monseigneur Duchesne, Professor Flinders Petrie, and others.

It is an intensely interesting narrative. Nobody knows for certain who Etheria was, but 'Dom Férotin's theory, amounting almost to a certainty, was that she was a fellow-countrywoman of Valerius, who had visited the East towards the end of the fourth century, *i.e.* in the reign of Theodosius (†395).' In any case Etheria 'displays great intelligence and exercises great powers of observation and appreciation of what she sees and hears wherever she goes. And this makes her narrative always lively and entertaining in spite of the defects in her style and occasional obscurity of meaning.'

The little book of the Rev. D. Ambrose Jones, M.A., entitled *Philosophic Thought and Religion* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net), might be called an Introduction to Modern Philosophy. For it touches upon all the philosophical systems from Hume to Bergson. But that is not the author's purpose. His purpose is to prove that if any system of philosophy is to explain the universe, religion must be at the heart of it. Religion is universal. It is an instinct and an intuition. 'Man continues to be aware of something in touch with himself, full of wondrous power and grandeur, but a source of awe. In this conscious awareness, mysterious as it is and co-extensive as mankind, is to be found the root of religion.'

Who is the most prominent rationalist of to-day? The honour is divisible between Mr. Joseph

McCabe and Mr. J. M. Robertson. The Rev. H. G. Wood, Warden of Woodbrooke Settlement, votes for Mr. Robertson. He has studied Mr. Robertson's books (and there are many of them), and he thinks it worth his while, not only to study them carefully but also to answer them seriously. The answer does not take long to read, but it is very comprehensive and very crushing. Mr. Wood distributes Mr. Robertson's attacks on Christianity into departments. One of these departments is the use of the argument from silence. It is scarcely possible that Mr. Robertson can be ignorant of the danger of the argument from silence. Yet Mr. Wood shows that he uses it with a simple completeness that takes one's breath away. Everything is myth in the Gospels that is not found in all four. Further, everything is myth even if it is found in all four Gospels if it is not also supported by the Pauline literature. The consequences are sweeping. In the Pauline Epistles there is no allusion to the miracles of Christ, and no reference to His teaching. We must assume, therefore, that Jesus did nothing and said nothing. That is one example of Mr. Robertson's methods. Mr. Wood gives us many more. And so fair and gentle is he in his handling of the prominent rationalist that the effect of the little book is utterly to discredit Mr. Robertson's capacity for the work to which he has devoted his life. The title is *Rationalism and Historical Criticism* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net).

A very able and altogether excellent book on Missions has been written by Sir Arthur Hirtzel, K.C.B., and published under the title of *The Church, the Empire, and the World* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). The author's outspokenness is most refreshing. His interest in missions and his intimate acquaintance with them are most encouraging. But he has a definite purpose. He wants us to turn our voluntary societies into one great imperial enterprise, to be recognized and financed by the Empire. And he knows that if anything of the kind is to be done it must be done by the laity. He himself is ready to take his share in it. He is fit enough to be a leader. Certainly the present state of things is deplorable. His picture is quite true: 'It is not going too far, speaking generally, to say that Foreign Missions, having been left to the voluntary societies, form no part, as such, of the ordinary work of the Church as conceived by the clergy. If we look throughout the length and breadth of the land, in how many churches shall we find that Foreign Missions regularly form the subject of sermons, apart from periodical "begging" sermons in behalf of particular societies? One knows of a parish here and there where the vicar regularly once a month preaches on Foreign Missions, without necessarily having a collection for them. But how many such are there? Or again, in how many churches does Foreign Mission work regularly form the subject of corporate intercession at the Holy Communion? How many parish priests instruct the children in Sunday school or at other times, as a part of the regular curriculum in this part of their duty as members—or about to become members—of the Church? or at all events give lessons in what we may call Christian geography, and attempt at least to rouse the children's interest in the Foreign Mission field? Or again, the bishops. They have, of course, a great deal else to do; but no small part of their time is occupied in confirmations, and in how many confirmation addresses is it ever even hinted to the children, now solemnly taking upon themselves the promises and vows on the strength of which they were received into the congregation of Christ's flock, that that congregation is a world-wide congregation?'

Divine Omnipotence.

By the Reverend F. R. Tennant, D.D., Lecturer in Theology and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The meaning which the word 'omnipotence,' as denoting an attribute of God, should bear in theology is a matter of importance in several theological connexions, and especially for the discussion of the problems of Creation and of the Existence of Evil. Indeed, theology can easily be made to appear nonsensical if it is to be pinned down to such an interpretation of the term as would take it to imply that there is absolutely nothing that an omnipotent God cannot be or do. And if ever theology, when pressed to reconcile the evil of the world with the goodness of God, plead that omnipotence implies certain limitations, while, when it wants to establish belief in the future extinction of evil, it slides into using the word in its strict or unqualified sense, and then asserting that an omnipotent God must certainly triumph over perverted human free-will, it no doubt lays itself open to the accusation that it is, however unintentionally, involving itself in a dangerous confusion. And the question which it is important to answer, is whether it is possible to vindicate our belief that evil is a present necessity though destined ultimately to be overcome, without vacillating in our use of the word 'omnipotence.'

There is no doubt that theology cannot adopt the term in its 'strict sense' as above defined. For, among other reasons, that sense is nonsensical. It implies, for instance, that God can at once cause a thing to exist and to be non-existent, or disregard the fundamental laws of thought; and it enables such dilemmas to be put as the old question: Could God create a being of such a nature that He could not subsequently destroy it? Either answer we make to such a question is fatal to that omnipotence which the putting of the question presupposes; and this plainly indicates meaninglessness somewhere. The theist attributes to God certainly as much limitation as is required to make omnipotence exclude self-contradictoriness; and he has accordingly been asked to abandon the word 'omnipotent.' To this he will see no objection apart from mere inconvenience; and even if the request seem pedantic, he might otherwise be willing to acquiesce. But, on the other hand, inasmuch as the 'strict' sense can be shown to be meaningless, he has even more right to suggest that *it* is the one which should be dropped.

The meaninglessness of 'omnipotence,' when it implies control over the possible and the impossible alike, might conceivably be shown in two ways. One of these assumes that the fundamental laws of logic—the principles of contradiction, excluded middle, etc.—are valid and real independently of God, and impose themselves upon Him just as they impose themselves upon us, with necessity, because they must be true of all thought, whether divine or human. Such an assumption will seem reasonable to common sense. But we shall do well not to rely upon it entirely, because the abstruse question whether the valid—such as the law of contradiction—can be real or can subsist, independently of existent beings or things of which it is valid, is debatable. There are some philosophers who hold that the valid apart from the existent, laws apart from things that exhibit or obey them, are but an abstraction and a mental figment: there can be no eternal *prius* of law, even of laws so fundamental as the laws of logic, eternal to or independent of the actual, or of God. Such laws, as much as the empirically discovered laws of Nature, must be grounded in the nature of God, which is simply what it is: 'I am that I am.' If, then, we adopt this latter view, we shall not be able to look upon the distinction between the possible and the impossible as a distinction having reality apart from, independently of, the nature of God and His world; though this would have been the most direct way of showing that the idea of omnipotence which disregards any such distinction is inherently absurd.

But there is another way open to us, and one which I believe is not beset with controversial difficulties. It is to assert that God, to be God at all, must be a *determinate* Being: not an indeterminate Absolute in whom all differences are lost. To be or exist is to be something, this and not that. 'I am that I am' implies 'I am not what

I am not': neither everything in general, nor nothing in particular. All determination, says Spinoza, is negation: negation, that is, of other conceivable characteristics. In that God is love, for instance, He is not hate; in that He wills a world that is an evolutionary moral order, He does not will a statically perfect paradise of angelic spirits; and so on. What is possible may thus be determined by what God is; and we need not look to reality outside or independent of Him wherewith to limit an omnipotence that involves superiority to determinateness. God simply is self-consistent, and is so without any diminution of His majesty. Determinateness, then, implies limitation of a kind; but not necessarily such limitation as seems to be implied sometimes in the phrase 'a finite God'—*i.e.* a God who is only somewhat superior in power and goodness to ourselves. Philosophers have endeavoured sometimes to conceive of an unconditioned Absolute in whom all determinateness and all differences are lost. But such an Absolute is far from being identical with the God of religion. And indeed it is not only philosophers who have resorted to the conception of an absolute Being for whom, and as to whom, impossibility is possibility; theologians, in their search for a conception of a perfect Being, have in the past adopted a similar self-stultifying notion. Some of the Fathers of the Church conceived of God in complete abstraction from His attributes such as wisdom, power, love, and so relegated Him to the realm of the unknowable, or resolved the living Spirit into a mere abstract idea.

This, of course, is the outcome of Oriental adulation rather than of philosophical theology. But modern Western philosophers have also at times fallen into the same error of confounding the idea of an omnipotent God with an indeterminate Absolute, especially when dealing with the problem of evil and arguing from the state of the world to atheism. They have taken omnipotence to imply not merely capacity to do whatever it is possible to do, but also the power arbitrarily to determine what is possible, and even to determine that the impossible shall be possible. What is possible may, as we have seen, have to be determined by what God is; but so long as 'possible' and 'impossible' have any meaning, their meanings must be different, and so long as their meanings are not distinguished it is meaningless to talk of omnipotence.

We need, then, clearly to recognize that there are qualifications to be added to what has been called the 'strict'—but which it would be better to call the 'absurd'—sense of 'omnipotent.' We do not mean by 'power' the capacity to realize a contradiction; consequently 'all-powerful' does not denote any such capacity. God is determinate and self-consistent; and consequently many appeals that are commonly made to His omnipotence are really but postulations of His self-contradictoriness. These at least should have no place in theology, nor should they be allowed without challenge to opponents of theological beliefs. We are too apt to assume that, as Dr. Martineau expressed it, there is nothing we may not ask of the omnipotence of God, and that no petition can be unreasonable addressed to such a Being. 'But it is absurd to treat the limits to such demands as a denial of the divine Almightiness; it is not a question about the power of doing, but of the compatibility of being and the consistency of thought.' How commonly omnipotence is mistaken for incompatibility of being and inconsistency of thought will have appeared in my previous articles dealing with the problems of suffering and moral evil. It is absurd, for example, to question the goodness of God because, in making moral beings, He did not make them temptationless; or because He did not make moral beings devoid of self-determination; or because the world, assumed to be a theatre of moral life, is a law-abiding, and yet not a painless cosmos: for all these 'possibilities' are self-contradictory, and therefore logical impossibilities, ruled out by the very nature of God.

If we dare not commit ourselves to the view that laws may be valid or real independently of God, because it involves disputable and disputed matters, in order to escape deriving the evil of the world, in the last resort, from the nature of God (for if there be no such independent laws, there remains nothing, prior to creation, other than God), we can still ground those laws, from which the necessity of evil follows, in the nature of God Himself, as we have seen; and to do so is only to ascribe to Him that determinateness and self-consistency without which there can be neither love, nor wisdom, nor truth, nor purpose. Limitations of omnipotence then become necessary accompaniments of determinate being; and it is only with this reservation that theology needs to qualify

that divine attribute, and only in so far as that reservation and nothing more is implied that it can adopt the phrase (which has lately passed into popular literature) 'a finite God,' when the question of divine power is under consideration. Such a reservation is not only necessary in order to make any theodicy, any vindication of God's goodness in face of the existence of evil, a possibility; it is also necessary for theology in general, for any conception of God which can be of value for religion. There are indeed other respects in which limitation, even if it be self-limitation, must be ascribed to God; the existence of finite selves and of their delegated freedom involves drawing a distinction between God and the whole of reality. Discussion of such limitation, however, will be more in place when, in a future article, we shall be concerned with the idea of a 'finite' God.

For the present we need but to point out the bearings of the conclusions at which we have arrived concerning omnipotence upon the hope, which any theodicy must justify, that human freedom with its power to hinder or thwart the will of God, is not necessarily destined to prevent the ultimate triumph of the good, and the realization of God's purpose for man. Some reasons have already been advanced in a previous article for believing that, in spite of the real limitation of omnipotence implied in the existence of finite free agents, the good is not doomed to be overwhelmed by evil. And to what was then urged, a few further remarks may now be added.

There is something in goodness which promotes its conservation, and something in evil which augurs disruption and extinction, free-will notwithstanding. And this is their intrinsic nature. The apparent gains of wickedness are not consolidated; evil purposes conflict, and so conspiracy in evil is thwarted. On the other hand there is inevitably a growing consensus of the good, and conquests in goodness are maintained. There is unity of aim, commonness of purpose and interest, between men of good-will. Good can come out of evil, but not evil out of good. The gains of good over evil are cumulative. For the higher the moral tone of the many, the harder to realize and the more obviously evil become the evil inclinations of the few. It is no easy optimism, therefore, on which we rely, but the intrinsic nature of goodness and evil, when we indulge the hope that the moral progress of mankind which history hitherto records will proceed in future ages. And if this be so, the objection that a God who is not omnipotent in the sense that for Him possibility and impossibility are alike, is inadequate to secure the ultimate triumph of goodness, loses its force. We have no need in this connexion to appeal to divine omnipotence in any sense other than that which alone we have found to be reasonable and meaningful: for it is in virtue of God being what He is that goodness and evil are what they intrinsically are, while it is in virtue of their being what they are that the one is destined to prevail over the other.

Contributions and Comments.

Did St. Paul quote Euripides?

THE question of the actual amount of literary culture that St. Paul had experienced, outside of Judaism, is one that is constantly recurring in unexpected forms. It began simply enough with the references to Aratus and Cleanthes in the speech before the Areopagus; it went on and included a copy-book line from Menander in the oration on the Resurrection: then it was noticed that his own story of his conversion contained an underlying Greek proverb, about the ox that kicks the goad, as old as Aeschylus or Pindar; and the latest discovery of all discloses the fact that a supposed solitary line of his from Epimenides about the Cretans and their great Lie could be duplicated and its whole context restored. I am now going to show that a fresh ray of illumination on the Acts of the Apostles will be cast by the assumption of an acquaintance on the part of the Apostle with what is deservedly one of the most popular dramas of Euripides. In the twenty-first chapter of the Acts we have the account of the riot in Jerusalem, and the rescue of St. Paul by the Roman military governor. On the stairs of the Castle of Antonia, down which the soldiery had

rushed into the Temple area to suppress the riot, Paul calls a halt, and asks to be allowed to say a word to the commanding officer. The latter expresses surprise: he had taken him for one of the recent Mahdis of Judaism. The prisoner has addressed him in Greek; he professes astonishment. The prisoner remarks:

'I am a Jew, to be sure, but I come from Tarsus in Cilicia, and I am a citizen of no mean city.'

This was not exactly an answer; for the Egyptian demagogue, with whom he had been identified, might also have been able to speak Greek, and have begun with the remark that he was of Alexandria, and that Alexandria was a fine city. Evidently there is something more forcible in the prisoner's remark than the mere statement that he came from this town in the North or that city in the South. The key to the conversation will be found in the opening verses of the *Ion* of Euripides, where Athens is described by Hermes in the words:

ἔστιν γὰρ οὐκ ἄσημος Ἑλλήνων πόλις,

which Way translates somewhat feebly:

'There is a famous city of the Greeks.'

Here we have St. Paul's expression, *plus* the added word Ἑλλήνων. And this word was necessary to answer effectively the inquiry of the commandant, Do you know *Greek*?

The Apostle describes Tarsus as a second Athens, in terms that would be familiar to any educated person, moderately well read in the Greek masterpieces. I suggest that the word Ἑλλήνων should be restored to the text, and that the words should be printed as a quotation. The whole Euripidean verse should be restored. The commandant said to himself, 'A gentleman, clearly, and a scholar,' and then gave him leave to address the crowd, which he did in Aramaic, with no attempt to translate the Euripidean tag, where it would have been unintelligible. If the suggestion here made is valid, we have a new Greek author for St. Paul's library.

Against this, however, it may be urged that the expression οὐκ ἄσημος is conventional (an objection which will not apply to the combination οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως). The lexicons tell us it is common in Greek from Euripides onwards (referring no doubt to the passage of the *Ion* given above); the commentators tell us it is a familiar form of speech, whether for critics or for men, and refer us to the instances given in that storehouse of learning, the Greek New Testament of Wetstein, who quotes the *Ion*-passage with the rest.

Thus our argument for an actual use of a Euripidean verse might be negatived, except so far as Ἑλλήνων is required in the text as an answer to the Ἑλληνιστὶ γινώσκεις; but if we concede that the answer to the question, 'What! you a *Greek*?' is properly 'Yes! from a not ignoble *Greek* city'; then we may claim that Paul knew the text of the *Ion* in at least its opening verses: and we add the book to his rapidly increasing Greek library. For, be it observed, that the coincidence is not one made by Luke, out of his stores of Greek learning; the reply must be from Paul himself, and we have the apostolic book-shelf as under:

Aratus, Menander, Aeschylus (?), Pindar (?), Epimenides, Euripides.

Mr. A. B. Cook points out to me that the Euripidean line was bound to be famous, as were all the allusions to Athens in Greek literature; and that we probably have another echo of it in Dionys. Hal. *ant. Rom.* 2. 35: Καινίνη μὲν δὴ καὶ Ἄντεμνα πόλεις οὐκ ἄσημοι, γένος ἔχουσαι τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, where the added reference to the Hellenic origin of the cities mentioned should be noted, as furnishing a confirmation of the explanation we have given of the passage in the Acts.

RENDEL HARRIS.

Ryland's Library, Manchester.

Note on John vi. 37.

THERE are two graphic touches in this familiar verse which give it a very special meaning. (1) The evidently intended distinction between the verbs ἥκω and ἔρχομαι. Godet drew attention to it, and, though Meyer rejects it, the underlying imagery of the verse requires it. The distinction is emphatic in He 10[37], 'He that is coming shall arrive.' In this verse our Lord says, 'Every one the Father giveth to me shall not fail to come, he shall arrive.' (2) Every one who is coming to Him he will never—on no account—'cast forth without.' The expression οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω is specially forceful. Ἔξω always implies outside of a place; as of a house

(Mt 5^{13}, Jn 18^{16}); or of a city (Lk 13^{33}), 'outside Jerusalem'; and so, out of a society or fellowship (Jn $9^{22.34}$). It is used, by itself, of those 'without' (Mk 4^{11}, 1 Co $5^{12.13}$; note also Lk 13^{25}). The full significance of ἔξω after ἐκβάλω requires us to recognize the picturesque character of the verse. Underlying it is the whole parable in Lk 15^{11-32}. The Son who has gone out from his home to the far country is drawn homeward only by his father's influence, by the memory of the abundance of goodness in his father's house, the happiness of his father's servants, and is sustained on his way home by the unquenchable assurance of his father's love for him, which, despite all his unworthiness, will make some place for him in the old home again. One so coming will not find an elder brother who will turn him to the door, casting him outside as one who can have no place in the father's house. On the contrary, every one coming will find not only an open door but a forthcoming love to welcome him and bring him within; for, Christ says, he came to do—to bring to pass, to accomplish—his father's will.

It is not conceivable that he, whose will is to do the Father's will, would leave standing without, unwelcomed—far less that he should ever put out of the father's house any one whom the father has brought into it. Bengel correctly says: 'There is a litotes' (*i.e.* the meaning is more than the words) 'I will not cast him out, but by all means preserve him.' And Meyer, quoting Bengel, well adds—'a litotes full of love'; but he is wrong, surely, in interpreting, 'I certainly will not cast him out, *i.e.* will not exclude him from my kingdom on its establishment.' It is a present welcoming which is promised, which will know no 'putting away,' from which there shall be no more going out. There was just such a vivid picture in our Lord's mind when He spoke these familiar words as He drew for us in His parable; and it is well to note the entire agreements between the record of St. Luke and St. John as revealing the mind of our Lord. 'The Parable of the Prodigal Son' has been called 'The Pearl of Parables.' This verse in St. John may be called the seed-pearl, for all that is told in the parable is told in its few graphic words.

ARCH$^{D.}$ HENDERSON.

Crieff.

Jesus writing on the Ground.

M. PAUL HUMBERT, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for July, p. 475, does not cite the *Lisân al-ʿArab* quite fairly in his interesting note on 'Writing on the Ground.' The Arabic Dictionary gives a list of the various senses of the word *khaṭṭ*, and the paragraph about the conjurer has no connexion with the preceding observation on the sense of the phrase 'he writes on the ground.' Thus in the Dictionary called *Taj al-ʿArus* (Cairo, 1307, vol. v.) the observation on this phrase is given p. 131, line 25, whereas the passage about the conjurer is to be found line 12 above.

The practice of 'writing on the ground' when people are reflecting is often mentioned in Arabic literature, where the word usually employed is *nakata*. A case is quoted by Dozy from Tabari (in Kosegarten's Chrestomathy, 102. 2): '*The Caliph Manṣur hung his head, and began to mark* (*yankutu*) *the ground with a reed in his hand.*' The phrase is quoted in the *Dictionary of Tradition*, and the act is said to be that of a person who is deeply pondering.

Examples of the practice are cited from the Greek classics by Lücke in his commentary. Any connexion which it may have with magic must be ordinarily unknown to the person who indulges in it.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

Oxford.

The Aramaic Acts.

Dr. C. C. TORREY, Professor of Semitic Languages at Yale University, published in 1916 No. 1 of the 'Harvard Theological Studies' under the title, 'The Composition and Date of Acts.' He argued strongly for an Aramaic original for the first fifteen chapters.

In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, vol. xxviii. No. 4, (January 1917, pp. 145, 146), you notice Ac 2^{47}, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, as a clear case in which Dr. Torrey's suggested Aramaic basis would solve a real difficulty. He found easily an Aramaic word which would be translated by these Greek words. The Aramaic has two meanings. In the Judean dialect it means 'greatly.' In the Aramaic of Northern Syria it signifies 'together.' If St. Luke made his translation at a distance from Judea he would know only one of the meanings. He failed to

understand that the verse was intended to say: 'The Lord added greatly day by day to the saved.'

Professors Foakes Jackson (New York), B. W. Bacon (Yale), W. J. Wilson (California), and A. A. Vazakas (New York), have discussed Dr. Torrey's monograph in American quarterly theological journals.

Professor Torrey has replied to his critics in the *American Journal of Theology*, vol. xxiii. Nos. 1 and 2 (January and April 1919, pp. 61–86, 189–212). He accepts much from all four. On some points he yields or modifies his former views. On others he maintains his ground. He will not surrender the Unity of Acts to Professor Bacon. He is sensitive to the expressions 'meticulous accuracy' (Dr. Jackson) and 'slavish and illogical faithfulness' (Professor Wilson), applied to St. Luke as the suggested translator of the original Aramaic 'Acts.'

The Hellenistic Seminar of the University of Manchester have been studying closely the linguistic problems of the Book of Acts. Naturally this discussion in the American journals has been followed with interest. There was one point in Professor Wilson's first article which was felt to require further investigation. He considered that Dr. Torrey was right in restoring the original Aramaic of Ac 1^2 as בְּרוּחָא דִי קוּדְשָׁא. To St. Luke, the translator, the phrase could have only one meaning. He rendered it accordingly, διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, 'through the Holy Spirit.' What the Aramaic author wished to express may have been something very different. The preposition בְּ, among its many uses, has occasionally the sense of 'concerning.' 'On the day when he issued instructions with regard to the Holy Spirit' would be an appropriate designation for Ascension Day. The author conceived of the events of Pentecost as the prelude to the whole of ecclesiastical history, and of Ascension Day as the introduction to Pentecost. The phrase 'concerning the Holy Spirit,' Dr. Wilson contends, would provide an object for the verb ἐντειλάμενος which is lacking in the present Greek text.

Two members of our Seminar were deputed to consider this interpretation. One was to examine the sentence in the light of Classical and Hellenistic Greek. The other was to report upon the uses of the prefix בְּ and its equivalents in all the Semitic languages. The scrutiny of this passage has disclosed no very convincing evidence of an Aramaic original.

In Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, and Ethiopic, respectively, the prefix ב, ܒ, ب, ב, has occasionally the sense of the Greek περὶ, Latin *de*, or English 'concerning.' Assyrian has no idiom, corresponding to this prefix in the other Semitic languages.

In Hebrew we find בְּ translated by περὶ in the LXX in 1 S $19^{3.4}$ 25^{39}, Ps 88^3 122^8. It is translated by ἐν in the sense of 'concerning' in Dt 6^7 11^{19}, Ps 71^6 119^{46}, Song of Sol 8^8. In Jer 38^{24}, 'about these words' (בַּדְּבָרִים) is rendered by ἐκ τῶν λόγων. The references are to chapter and verse in the Hebrew text, not in the English or LXX.

In Syriac there are clearly established examples of ܒ in the sense of 'concerning.' The Syriac Hexaplar appends ܒܝ, 'concerning me' (ἐν εμοὶ, LXX, Codex A.) to Jg 11^{36}. In 1 S 31^{11}, ܒܫܐܘܠ, 'concerning Saul,' is employed instead of the Hebrew לְשָׁאוּל, 'to Saul.' In *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (vol. III. ii. 208) we find ܒܗ, 'concerning him,' and in vol. II. ii. 423, ܒܕܝܢܐ, 'concerning religion.'

In Arabic ب occurs with the same significance. In Quran xxv. 60, we find بِهِ, 'concerning Him'; lvii. 13, بِاللّٰهِ, 'with regard to God'; lxx. 1, بِعَذَابٍ, 'concerning punishment'; and lxxxii. 6, بِرَبِّكَ, 'concerning thy Lord.'

Ethiopic employs በ occasionally with this meaning. ተናገረ : በ, 'to speak concerning,' is found in Song of Sol 8^8, Sir $44^{8.15}$ 17^9; and 2 S 17^{19} is rendered, 'There was no one who knew about it' (በመሠ).

It is evident that the idiom was sufficiently well established for it to be used by the suggested author of the Aramaic Acts, and sufficiently rare for it to have been misunderstood by St. Luke in translating. We have still to ask what meaning he attributed to the phrase which he is alleged to have mistranslated.

There can be no doubt as to what he under-

stood by words which he employed. He uses the phrase διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου in three other places in Acts (4[25] 11[28] 21[4]). 'Prompted of God,' 'animated by a holy zeal,' 'actuated by an impulse from the Holy One of Israel' are meanings which he expresses by the term. St. Luke understood the Aramaic original to have recorded something that Jesus did. He thought it desirable to emphasize that this was prompted by God. This could not have been the mere giving of instructions upon any subject whatever. Against this the order of the words protest loudly. Why should St. Luke not have written ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, or ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἐντειλάμενος διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. The sense further forbids the interpretation. If he means ἐντειλάμενος to be associated with διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, what is the point in his insisting, as he does, upon the Apostles having been selected from the rest of the disciples (τοῖς ἀποστόλοις . . . οὓς ἐξελέξατο)?

No one who reads the preface to the Gospel and the preface to the Acts will deny that the words have been arranged in artistic composition, not unlike that displayed by Plato in the opening of his Republic. The structure of the sentences must be considered. Any interpretation, to be accepted, must explain how St. Luke came to arrange the words as he has done. An examination shows that the opening clauses group and balance themselves somewhat as follows:—

Ver. 1.	Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην	= 3 beats.
	περὶ πάντων ὦ Θεόφιλε	= 2 ,,
	ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς	= 2 ,,
	ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν	= 3 ,,
Ver. 2.	ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας	= 3 ,,
	ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις	= 2 ,,
	διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου	= 2 ,,
	οὓς ἐξελέξατο ἀνελήμφθη	= 3 ,,

Distribute these groupings as we may, there are no means of associating ἐντειλάμενος with διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου. It was not the spirituality of purpose which prompted these instructions to the Apostles which St. Luke sought to emphasize.

It was the choice or mission of these Apostles which he attributes so definitely to a spiritual motive. We find a kindred note in other parts of the Lucan writings. In Ac 13[2. 3] we observe εἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον . . . προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς . . . νηστεύσαντες . . . προσευξάμενοι . . . ἐπιθέντες χεῖρας. In the Gospel (6[12. 13]) προσεύξασθαι . . . προσεφώνησεν (Mk 3[13], προσκαλεῖται) . . . ἐκλεξάμενος . . . ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν. Besides these actual expressions, we have everywhere the thought familiar to St. Luke's mind, that the selection of men for apostleship or missionary work should be prompted and guided by God. The bare τοῖς ἀποστόλοις in Ac 1[2] would have been sufficient. St. Luke, however, has a reason for the addition of the words διὰ πν. ἁγ. οὓς ἐξελ. They contain an admonition for the future in a fact of the past.

Criticism has been directed against St. Luke's actual statement, that it gives no hint of the final commands which preceded the Ascension. Does it necessarily imply error or ignorance, that an author does not say everything in one sentence? The charge indicated in v.[2] may be contained in v.[4], παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι. The Greek runs smoothly and gives worthy sense. There would be sound stylistic reasons for reserving the substance of the command till v.[4]. The suggested Aramaic is far inferior in style. 'Having given command concerning the Holy Spirit,' crudely anticipates what follows. St. Luke's supposed translation not only misunderstood the original, but produced a doubled and muddled version. No one, unless biased by the idea of translation, would suspect any such false start in the Greek.

Another objection is urged on linguistic grounds, that ἐντειλάμενος requires something to define the content of these final instructions. This is an error. It is true that the verb is not used in that type of mature Attic prose of which Demosthenes is representative. As with so much of St. Luke's Greek, however, it is a word frequently employed by Herodotus, and, once at least, in this absolute way (iv. 94, ἐντέλλονται ἔτι ζῶντι).

The sum of these considerations will be, therefore, that St. Luke's Greek gives a clear sense, viz. —'Till the day on which he was taken up after giving instructions to the apostles whom he had chosen from the other disciples—an act done at the Father's prompting.' St. Luke does not attribute the instructions necessarily to the day of Ascension. He does emphasize, however, for whatever reason, the inspiration which guided the selection of the Apostles. There may have been an Aramaic original which St. Luke misinterpreted. He may have translated it with servile, literal,

illogical fidelity. Nevertheless he had a clear view of his own, and expressed that view, in Greek which it is still possible for the patient student to understand.

G. C. GLANVILLE.

Manchester.

Note on Luke iii. 16

(ἀπεκρίνατο).

IN N.T. the usual practice is to use the Passive Aorist forms, *ἀπεκρίθη*, *ἀποκριθείς*, instead of the Middle.

Out of some 200 instances in which either the Passive or the Middle is presumably possible we have the Middle in the following only.

Mt 27^{12}, Mk 14^{61}, Lk 3^{16} 23^{9}, Jn 5^{11} (S, but A and B give *ἀπεκρίθη*), Jn $5^{17.\ 19}$ 12^{28} (A only), Ac 3^{12}.

With two exceptions, Col 4^{6} and Rev 7^{13}, the verb *ἀποκρίνομαι* does not occur in N.T. outside of the Gospels and Acts.

In O.T. the same usage prevails. Out of over 200 instances of the Aorist we have it in the Middle only in the following, Ex 19^{19}, Jg 5^{29} (A, but B differs), 3 K 2^{1}, 1 Ch 10^{13}, Job 40^{2} (B, but A and S give *ἀποκρίθητι*), Ezk 9^{11}.

In *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, by Professors Moulton and Milligan, I find the following under *ἀποκρίνομαι* (Pt. i. p. 64):

'Thackeray tells us (*Gr.* p. 239) that *ἀπεκρίθην* "is employed throughout the LXX: the classical *ἀπεκρινάμην* in the few passages where it occurs seems to be chosen for solemn or poetical language."'

In the same article the authors of the vocabulary remarking on the absence of *ἀπεκρίθην* from the papyri after 2nd cent. B.C. suggest that the word belongs only to early Hellenistic, but passed from the LXX translators into N.T. 'as a definite Septuagintalism.'

In considering these suggestions attention should be given to the use of *ἀποκρίνομαι* by Diodorus Siculus, not much earlier than the earliest N.T. writers. In his works we find *ἀπεκρίθησαν* (11^{28}), *ἀπεκρίνατο* (11^{57}), *ἀπεκρίθη* (13^{59}), *ἀποκριναμένου* (15^{6}), *ἀπεκρίθη* ($15^{33.\ 41}$), *ἀποκριθείς* (15^{52}), *ἀπεκρίθη* (16^{13}), *ἀποκριθέντος* (16^{17}), *ἀποκριναμένης* (16^{27}), *ἀπεκρίθη* and *ἀποκριναμένων* (Excerpt. de Legat. iv 619), *ἀπεκρίθη* (Excerpt. de Legat., xxvi. 626 and Eclog. i. 542). Possibly there are other instances.

It will be seen at once that Diodorus mingles the two forms, but the Passive prevails just as in LXX and N.T.

In face of this it is difficult to accept the suggestion that *ἀπεκρίθην* had become a definite Septuagintalism in N.T. times, unless indeed the Septuagint had a wider influence than is usually supposed, a point worth further consideration.

Neither will an examination of the passages in which the Middle form occurs bear out Thackeray's view, that is, if we extend the application of his remark to N.T. times.

The difference between Diodorus and LXX and N.T. writers in the use of *ἀπεκρίθην* is that he uses the accusative and infinitive after it, a construction only occurring twice with this verb in N.T. and never in LXX, or else he uses a conjunction to introduce the dependent clause, also a very rare construction in LXX and N.T.

It is curious to note that John's Gospel, by dropping the familiar *καὶ εἶπε* after *ἀπεκρίθη* in over thirty out of seventy occurrences of this verb, comes nearer to the ordinary Greek of the time, judging by Diodorus, than any of the other Gospels.

In this connexion I would point out that the noun *ἀπόκρισις* is not infrequent in Diodorus, especially with the verb *διδόναι*, *e.g.* *ἀπόκρισιν ἔδωκαν* (15^{43}). Again it may be noted that in N.T. *ἀπόκρισιν διδόναι* is only used in John's Gospel, see 1^{22} and 19^{9}.

A complete analysis of the use of *ἀποκρίνομαι* by LXX and N.T. writers gives interesting results with which I hope to deal shortly, as well as with other resemblances between the Greek of Diodorus and that of LXX and N.T.

W. A. WATKINS.

Fritchley, Derby.

Common Sense in Criticism.

A WRITER in the March number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES under the heading 'The Septuagint Version of Leviticus,' as sometimes happens seems to *make* difficulties so as to be able to give explanation of them on modern lines. There is the fear too that, unless the reader of the article referred to the originals, he might easily carry away a wrong impression as to the facts.

It is attempted to prove that the LXX tried to

make their translation less anthropomorphic than the Hebrew original from which they were translating and therefore altered the expression לֶחֶם or לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים with references to sacrifices. He says that Lv 3^{11} is rendered in the LXX ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας, but he omits reference to the use of the word κάρπωμα here and in v.[16] which clearly stands for לֶחֶם taken in a general way as meaning food, which is its primary meaning, though specially used of bread. לֶחֶם is used with the identical meaning of κάρπωμα in Jer 11^{19}, 'the tree with its *fruit*.'

Moreover, it hardly seems likely on the face of it that God should be thought as partaking of this fat as food seeing it was completely burned on the altar; at least, if they did so regard it, they must have had a very clear idea of the immaterial nature of the Deity, since the food by burning is entirely lost in the estimation of an unscientific observer.

In the second illustration which he gives the so-called difficulty is removed by reference to the context, which shows the words are supposed to be addressed to the descendants of those actually present at the time; consequently the words 'their ancestors' refers to the men Moses is said to be actually addressing.

The writer of the article says that there was no Covenant between Yahweh and His people at the time they left Egypt. The phrase may not occur, but the principle of a covenant is surely implied in all that happened and especially in the institution of the Passover. If this is still disputed yet speaking in Lv 26^{45} in imagination to a future age, the perspective caused by distance would make it quite feasible to refer to the Covenant given on Sinai as having been given to the Israelites as they came out of Egypt, especially as they were still on the outward journey towards the Promised Land at the time.

It is all so simple when taken simply that we sometimes wonder whether the disease is not made to suit the medicine rather than the medicine sought for which will heal an obvious disease.

HERBERT CROSSLAND.

Chippenham, Wilts.

Entre Nous.

FOR THE MINISTRY.

Attractiveness.

IT is one of the misfortunes of books on preaching that they are unattractive. It is another that they warn the preacher against striving after attractiveness. For it is part of the preacher's business to be attractive. He also has to draw all men unto him. And it is an essential part of his business to make the service of God attractive.

Let us consider. And let us consider the preacher himself first.

The Person.

1. 'Some believers,' says McCheyne, 'are a garden that has fruit trees, and so are useful; but we also ought to have spices, and so be attractive.'

So all believers, and so above all the gospel messengers. Says Bishop Davies of Western Massachusetts, in one of the best of the homiletical books, *Priestly Potentialities*: 'We must not undervalue the power of personal attractiveness, for it is an inestimable quality for a fisher of men, a priceless qualification for a winner of souls. Indeed, it is the first thing to attract men. By it I do not mean,' says Bishop Davies, 'the mere possession of a cordial and kindly manner and a pleasant way of speaking, valuable as these are; but a something, not in the feature but in the expression, not in the words but in the tones of the voice, that has the mysterious power to attract. People felt it strongly about the late Bishop Collins of Gibraltar. They were struck by his wonderful face, "with its mingled look of exaltation and utter submission," and felt "that nameless thrill which some organ stops give," that dwelt in his voice. In that most touching little book, *Especially William, Bishop of Gibraltar, and Mary, his Wife*, it is related how Bishop Collins went to the Spanish Cathedral, to the funeral of a Jesuit Priest, and how, when he came out, the people pressed about him to kiss his hand: and when he demurred that he was the "English

'Catholicus,' their only answer was, "We know who you are!"'

(1) 'Not in the feature,' says the Bishop of Western Massachusetts, 'but in the expression.' Dr. John Brown, the author of *Rab and his Friends*, uses almost identical words of Dr. Chalmers: 'With all his homeliness of feature and deportment, and his perfect simplicity of expression, there was about him "that divinity that doth hedge a king." You felt a power, in him, and going from him, drawing you to him in spite of yourself. He was in this respect a *solar* man, he drew after him his own firmament of planets.'

(2) 'Not in the words, but in the tones of the voice.' Dr. Smellie tells us that when death called Murray McCheyne away, a note was opened which the post had brought to the door during his illness. It was written by one who was a total stranger, to thank him for the hour of worship at Broughty Ferry. 'I heard you preach last Sabbath evening, and it pleased God to bless that sermon to my soul. It was not so much what you said, as your manner of speaking, that struck me. I saw in you a beauty of holiness that I never saw before.'

2. But it is sheer goodness that is the great attraction. Not always. Goodness attracts and repels. Our Lord attracted and repelled. His 'fan was in his hand.' His teachings sifted His audiences. After some of His sayings 'many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him.' The people were charmed and fascinated by His *humanness*, especially as it stood contrasted with the pedantry of the Scribes and the self-righteousness of the Pharisees. But His spirituality repelled them. They were 'out of touch' with that. But *in the long run* our spiritual influence as ministers will be powerful and lasting in proportion as we enter into fellowship with 'the mind of Christ,' and cultivate His spirit of unselfishness and unworldliness.

One thing is certain. If goodness is to be attractive it must be unconscious of itself. There is an excellent illustration in Browning's 'Easter Day.' It describes the experiences of a Christian martyr. His testimony has been written for him after his death by a friend. There is a noteworthy absence in the account, just as there is in the Bible, of anything like hero-worship, of any sense of a man's having done anything out of the ordinary, anything meritorious. What the man did is, in his own eyes, hardly worth thinking about, and now that it is over he has forgotten all about it.

> I was born sickly, poor, and mean,
> A slave: no misery could screen
> The holders of the pearl of price
> From Cæsar's envy: therefore twice
> I fought with beasts, and three times saw
> My children suffer by his law;
> At last my own release was earned:
> I was some time in being burned,
> But at the close a Hand came through
> The fire above my head, and drew
> My soul to Christ, whom now I see.
> Sergius, a brother, writes for me
> This testimony on the wall—
> For me, I have forgot it all.

The Service.

What makes Public Worship attractive? Let us hear three different men on it—very different. Dr. Frank Ballard says: 'If public worship is to be made in the best sense attractive for the men and women of our time, other elements besides the preaching will have to be seriously reformed. Forty years of constant observation, sympathetic as well as thorough, compel one to plead for more reality in the general conduct of religious services. Not only must there be no childish sermons, but also no stupidly sanctimonious hymns; no lessons read with mechanical meaninglessness; no wearying substitution of quantity for quality in prayer—quality consisting in the hushed recognition of the nearness of God as awful as tender; no ring of listless if not talkative professionals in the choir seats; no conflict for the best back sittings; no chilly welcome for strangers.'

The Bishop of Durham demands *considerateness*, first and last. 'I mean,' says Dr. Moule, 'the simple motive of a loyal and faithful considerateness for others, as we are on the one hand Christian men and English gentlemen, and on the other hand servants, not masters, of the Church and parish. Possibly this aspect of the Pastor's public and official ministry may not have presented itself distinctively as yet to my younger Brother; but it cannot be recognized and acted upon too early. Some things in our clerical position and functions tend in their own nature to make us forget it, if we are not definitely awake to it beforehand. In some respects the Clergyman, even the youngest Curate, has dangerous opportunities for *in*considerate public action. Take the manage-

ment of Divine Service in illustration. In his manner of reading, his tone, his pace, the Clergyman may allow himself, only too easily, to think of himself alone. In the reading-desk, or at the Table of the Lord, he may consult only his own likes and dislikes in attitude, gesture, and air. But if so, he is greatly failing in the homely duty of loyal considerateness. What will be most for the happiness and edification of the congregation? What will least disturb and most assist true devotion? How shall the Minister best secure that the worshippers shall remember the Master and not be uncomfortably conscious of the servant? The answers to such questions will of course vary considerably under varying conditions; but it is *the principle* of the questions which I press home. Our office, and the common consent and usage of the Christian people, give us a position of independence in such matters which has its advantages, but also its very great risks; and it is for us accordingly to handle that independence with the utmost possible *considerateness*.'

Liddon finds the secret of attractiveness in public worship in the feeling communicated to the worshipper that behind the preacher or priest there is *a reserve of spiritual power*. He is explaining Christ's saying that John the Baptist was more than a prophet. He says what attracted the people to John was the feeling which is always inspired by the great religious character, of whose consistency we are well assured, but which we only half understand. It lives and moves before us, evidently in constant communion with God, while shrouding from the public eye much which our curiosity would fain explore. Of this reserve of spiritual power in St. John, his hermit life in the desert, his wild food, his dress of camel's hair, were aptly suggestive; they showed that this side of existence was repressed for the sake of the other, and that to John the other was incomparably the vaster and more real. Without analysing their feelings, these multitudes felt that in coming near to John the Baptist they were like travellers who stand at the base of a mountain which buries its summit in the clouds: they knew that a man of no common mould was there, and that he was worth understanding, if he could only be understood. This reserve is inevitable in the case of every great servant of God, and it goes to account for his attractive force. We too, moral pigmies as we are, long to catch a glimpse of that greater world in which God's spiritual aristocracy lives and works; we listen for the distant echo of its secrets; we are irresistibly drawn to claim such fellowship with it as we can, if only because it touches a chord in our souls which reminds us that we too have been created for the Infinite Being, and have before us, if we will, a destiny of boundless magnificence.

IMMORTALITY.

What are the alternatives to the Christian doctrine of Immortality? The Rev. James H. Snowden, D.D., LL.D., in his book entitled *Can We Believe in Immortality?* (Macmillan; $1.25), enumerates them thus.

First there is the immortality of earthly influence. The classical expression of this form of immortality, he says, is the familiar lines of George Elliot:

> Oh may I join the choir invisible
> Of those immortal dead who live again
> In minds made better by their presence: live
> In pulses stirred to generosity,
> In deeds of daring rectitude, in scorn
> For miserable aims that end with self,
> In thoughts sublime that pierce the night like stars,
> And with their mild persistence urge man's search
> To vaster issues. So to live is heaven.

'That,' he says, 'is good poetry, but it is poor comfort.' Perhaps the comfort is quite as good as the poetry. He is right enough, however, when he says that it is only by a figure of speech that we can call it immortality.

The next substitute for immortality which he mentions is the final perfection of the race. For this form of immortality he goes to Dr. G. Stanley Hall, and finds it in that extraordinary book *Jesus in the Light of Psychology*. The desire for immortality, says Dr. Hall, 'is at bottom the best possible indication that man as he exists to-day is only the beginning of what he is to be, the pigmoid or embryo of his true self. When he has completed and finished all that is now only begun in him, many transcendental structures will become useless. Thus doctrines of another life, whatever else they are, we may still regard as

symbols or tropes in mythic terms of the true superman as he will be and the great hope that so many have lived and died in will be fulfilled, every jot and tittle of it. The death-bed visions of those who have died hungering for more life will come true.' Dr. Snowden is somewhat attracted by the idea, but again he says, and very truly, that it is not immortality.

A third substitute for immortality is absorption in God. 'Human spirits pass into him as snowflakes melt into the sea. It is claimed that the accumulated worth of our earthly existence is thus conserved in the richer life of God, who is thus receiving into himself the successive generations of his children. They abide in him as essential worth, while the temporary form of personality has lapsed and the skirts of the individual are once more fused in the general whole.' Dr. Snowden calls this theory more subtle and plausible than the others. For there is an element of truth in it. Already we live and move and have our being in God, and in the eternal state we may pass into more intimate union with Him. We can never get outside of God, and in the state of final fellowship we may be included in His life in a kind of social consciousness or fellowship. The Christian view is that our lives shall be hid with Christ in God. Yet in this state our own personality is not absorbed in God but retains its consciousness and individuality.

> Eternal form shall still divide
> The eternal soul from all beside.

The conclusion is that the only real alternative to the Christian doctrine of Immortality is annihilation.

SOME TEXTS.

Acts ii. 47.

A difficult passage to translate, most difficult, is Ac 2^{47}. The Authorized translation is, 'And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.' The Revisers change that into 'And the Lord added to them (*margin*, together) day by day those that were being saved.' Weymouth renders the verse, 'Also, day by day, the Lord added to their number those whom he was saving'; the Twentieth Century translators, 'And the Lord daily added to their company those who were in the path of Salvation'; Moffatt, 'Meantime the Lord added the saved daily to their number.'

Professor F. C. Burkitt has a note on the text in the latest issue of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (xxxvii. 234). His translation is, 'And the Lord was bringing more of the Elect day by day together.' The 'saved' (Elect), he says, 'are surely those who in the interval between the proclamation of the Gospel and the expected Coming of Jesus were being converted, and so were being saved from the Wrath to come. Their number therefore is known to God; it is not being increased. But more and more may be brought *together*.'

Mark ii. 3.

The Rev. J. Alexander Findlay in his book on the second Gospel, illustrates St. Mark's 'vividness and love of telling detail.' Here is an example.

Mark ii. 3—'The "paralytic" is "borne by four . . . they unroofed the roof where He was, and digging away, they let down the bed" . . . Luke has "going up on to the roof they let him down through the tiles with the stretcher into the midst in front of Jesus." Luke is evidently thinking of a Roman villa; Mark—more correctly—of the old-fashioned workman's cottage. In the Roman house there was a hole called the "impluvium" in the centre of the tiled roof, but it is not likely that Peter's house would be more than a cottage built of mud. Dr. Abbott makes the interesting suggestion that there was a trap-door in the roof of some old Galilean cottages. A little chamber was often built in with the roof, and was connected with the rest of the house by means of a ladder which could be let down through the trap-door in the roof, while access to roof and roof-chamber could also be obtained by a mud or stone staircase at the back of the house, so that the lodger, such as Jesus sometimes was, could let himself in and out without disturbing the family—an excellent substitute for the modern latchkey! This explains how it came about that Jesus was able to slip away unnoticed before the household was stirring (i. 35); if the trap-door had not been used for some time, it would have to be raised from outside by means of a crowbar or some such instrument. This explains Mark's curious phraseology, and avoids the very practical difficulty that if part of the roof were really taken off there would have been a heavy shower of mud and plaster on the heads of the people below! For the "prophet's chamber" see 2 Kings iv. 10, and for the trap-door

in the sky, through which, it was thought, the rain came down, Gen. vii. 11, viii. 2; 2 Kings vii. 19; Mal. iii. 10.'

---

2 Cor. vi. 2.

'Now is the accepted time.' Are you old enough to have heard that text preached from evangelically? Do you remember the fervour and the terror of the preaching? How is it preached from now?

The Rev. Henry Howard is a modern preacher. That does not mean that he is not evangelical; it means that evangelical preaching is not as you know it. This is the way.

'The words translated "accepted time" are strikingly suggestive. They stand for the meeting-point of opportunity and desire, and thus have a subjective and an objective significance. The mental picture which they would suggest to a Greek mind would be that of a host waiting on the threshold of his open door to receive an honoured and expected guest. As Paul employs the phrase, it is to convey the idea of hospitality extended toward a great moral opportunity, which knocks at the door of every man's life, creating a crisis in which vast issues are to be determined and irrevocable decisions made. The tides of inward desire and determination have their ebb and flow, just as do the tides of outward opportunity. When these two tides both reach their flood at one and the same time, everything in the way of moral achievement or spiritual eventuation becomes possible to the human soul in whom they meet. The tragedy is when they do not coincide, when either desire finds no encouraging response in circumstance, or the call of circumstance finds no answering feeling of desire. Of what avail is it that the most splendid material or moral offer should present itself, if the desire or ability to embrace it be dead! It is this ebb-tide of desire that is so fatal, and gives such cause for alarm. Once this torpidity of disposition smites the soul, it is as though the will were drugged. There sets in an overpowering tendency to let things slide, and allow the logic of events to determine for us what we have not the moral energy to determine for ourselves. Such a disposition, unless struggled against and overcome, is the sure precursor of doom, whether in the moral or commercial world. When a man has reached the depths at which he says and means "I don't care," there is, humanly speaking, only one way up and out, and that is through sheer and cold-blooded determination. In such a case the man's will must come to the rescue. In the absence of all feeling, and just on the cold facts, as they are perceived and admitted by the judgement, let him act. Because right is right, to follow right, even though no faintest flicker can be detected in the pulse of desire, becomes the highest wisdom and the only way of life. Here is the true philosophy of the situation: when right feeling becomes too feeble to prompt right action, then right action must be encouraged to revive right feeling.'

Mr. Howard illustrates from the methods adopted to resuscitate those who have been rescued from drowning. 'Animation is suspended, and unless something is done, and done quickly, to induce breathing, life will speedily become extinct. Hence artificial means have to be resorted to. As the initiative cannot be taken by the unconscious person himself from within, it has to be taken by some one else from without. When the lungs refuse to act upon the outside air, the outside air must be made to act on them, in the hope that thus encouraged they may start again and keep up the running they had dropped. So when desire dies down in relation to duty, the will must come to the rescue and induce its resuscitation. This doing of one's duty with dogged determination, long after the desire for it or the delight in it has gone out, is perhaps the one and only way to kindle it anew. Fortunately the offer of salvation does not turn upon our good desires but on our moral determination.'

The title of the volume of sermons is *The Love that Lifts* (Epworth Press; 5s. net).

NEW POETRY.

Cecil Roberts.

Charing Cross, and Other Poems of the Period, by Mr. Cecil Roberts (Grant Richards; 3s. 6d. net), is a volume of realistic poetry referring to the war. But its realism is not the outrage that some volumes of poetry have recently been. Mr. Roberts is too good a poet for that. If he is a moralist, as all our poets are at present, he is also an artist. One of the most realistic and least uplifting is called

FUTILITY.

They send me, Charles, long letters on your death,
Full of fair phrases culled from poetry
That do not blind me—let them save their breath;

The nectared lies of immortality,
The sounding rhetoric, the pompous phrase,
The talk of supreme sacrifice, the great
Reward—what are these 'gainst your withered days,
Your dear lost face, the squalor of your fate?
That you were brave, I know, but still you clung
To life that meant so much; they say you cried
In that last hour feeling you were so young,
And desperately fought for life—and died.
These letters, Charles, they mock me with their lies,
Their borrowed phrases that belittle life
And love and laughter—I can see your eyes
As once they glowed, your body like a knife
Tempered and flashing in a summer sea,
Or hear your voice enraptured over books,
Or in the bathroom singing merrily
At early morn, and days in river nooks
And tennis sets—these memories all seem
Like ghosts that haunt your room now you are gone,
And make me think your end is but a dream,
How can it be the end—at twenty-one?
But when I read these letters, then I know
You will not come again, nor does their praise
Lighten the heaviness of this great blow,
I cannot kiss your brow, nor see the place
Where they have left you; as they write of fame,
Your 'splendid gift,' my only thought is this—
What will they care ten years hence for your name,
Who cares a damn who died at Salamis?

Edith A. Craven.

Edith A. Craven calls her little book *Poems in War Time* (Foyle; 1s. net). But the war is by no means oppressively present in them. The oppression may have been on the author's own spirit and life. But if so she rises above it by faith in Christ. We quote one short, simple, representative poem:

MY DESIRE.

To help a weary soul along life's way,
To cheer a downcast spirit day by day;
To live my life that with each setting sun,
I truthfully may say, 'Thy Will be Done.'
To take a ray of sunshine where I go,
To help perplexed mankind with truths I know,
That others, too, with every setting sun,
In truthfulness may say, 'Thy Will be Done.'

Florette Truesdell Miller.

In *Hadassah: The Star of the Persian Court* (Stratford Co.; $1.25), Florette Truesdell Miller offers us a poetical version of the Book of Esther. 'I have tried,' she says, 'to set forth the purity of Esther's heart and life as the cause of her great influence with a heathen king, rather than her personal charms; and to show the superiority of her motive, over that of Vashti, which was womanly pride. I have made Mordecai unselfish in his position of non-conformist, obeying God's word in spirit and in letter.' This is the description of Esther as she first appeared to Ahasuerus:

When he beheld her grace, almost divine
Because her heart was pure, he felt a thrill,
As if a spirit from a purer world
Ethereal, had entered and approached.
And when, her queenly head upraised, he saw
Her face, he wondered if a vision passed,
When she answering, fixed her gentle gaze
Upon his piercing eyes, the clear white light
Of truth shone there, which looked and saw beyond,
Like a bright, high-shining, heavenly star.

Eric Dickinson.

Mr. Dickinson's volume, *The Ilex Grove* (Blackwell; 1s. 6d. net), opens with five sonnets. We shall quote one of them:

Dear Father God, methinks in rulèd love
I am Thine instrument to make amends
Unto those lonely lives who from above
Have caught so little to sustain Thine ends.
O strengthen me that I may speak for pain
Where pain so yields in dire abundance grown,
And hushed the voice of all those thousands slain—
O strengthen me to aid the needy thrown!
So many, oh, so many, know not how
To balance this fair gift of life who are
For resting by a spread of Eden's bough!
May I not take them through moon-waters far

Beyond the tinselled tawdry court of this
Most wretched play to Love's unending bliss?

The rest of the poetry is not so religious as that, but it is the fruit of the same creative imagination, and some of it is yet more felicitous in expression.

Elsa Lorraine.

Much of our modern poetry, and strange to say much of the best of it, is difficult to read and understand. It is no use complaining. It is no use calling the provoking obscurity of it a foolish fashion. Behind every fashion there is either a social or a psychological factor. We have to accept it and make the most of it. Elsa Lorraine is a difficult poet. And her new book *Triptych* (Blackwell; 3s. net) is as difficult as ever. But she is a poet. This short poem will prove it:

Silence of God! thou wondrous wall
Against whose weathered stones I lean,
The little green things grow between,
And yet men beat on thee and call:
'What can He mean?'

Thou art so warm with suns of trust,
With the past summers of the lives
Of all His saints—though Science strives
To lay thee level with the dust,
Thy calm survives.

While the world clamours for reply
To all its petty questionings,
Ah me! what peace the knowledge brings
That none shall scale thee so, most High,
That none have wings!

For God alone, some glorious day
Will, of His unexplored estate,
Fling wide the wall as 'twere a gate
And bid all enter, none away. . . .
Meanwhile I wait.

Gerald Crowe.

In the most recent volume of Oxford poetry published by Mr. Blackwell there were four poems by Mr. Gerald Crowe, and in reviewing that volume we quoted one of them. They are here again in the little volume entitled *Fifteen Poems* (Blackwell; 1s. 6d. net). That Mr. Crowe was so represented in the Oxford book shows that he was reckoned a poet by the editors of it; that out of all the poems in that book one of his was selected for quotation, shows that we thought him one of the best poets. The choice of any other poem here will strengthen that opinion. Take the daring lines entitled

HUMILITY.

Take counsel, O my friend, of your heart's pride,
And choose the proud thing alway. Never heed
The 'wretched, rash, intruding fools' of the world;
Nor take the half-truths that life brings old men
For wisdom; nor the naked indecencies
That purity mongers have shamed children with
For goodness; nor the silly hypocrisies
Of mean minds for humility. But say,
'God is my father. Christ was young and died
To comfort me. The towering archangels
With all their blue and gold and steely mail
Are my strong helpers and mine elder brothers.
The sweet white virgins gone to martyrdom
Calm-eyed and singing are my sisters.' Yea,
Because of all these things keep your heart proud.
Be proud enough to serve the poor, too proud
To attend the rich; enough to love, not fawn,
And give, not sell. Remember gentleness
Is the heart's pride of understanding, truth
Her greatness that will not be afraid for wrath
Nor flatter favour. This remember also,
The pure in heart shall walk like fierce white flames
Questing across the world in goodlier hope
And knightlier courtesy than they of the Graal,
For these are they in the end that shall see God.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Is it possible to get rid for ever of the conflict of duties in life? Is it possible to obtain immediate direction from God on every step that has to be taken? The Rev. Basil MATHEWS, M.A., and the Rev. Harry BISSEKER, M.A., believe that it is possible.

Together they have written a book about it. The title is *Christian Fellowship in Thought and Prayer* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). And the title is well chosen. For the whole secret lies in that word 'fellowship.' The Christian cannot get rid of his perplexities if he prays alone. He must pray in fellowship. He must think in fellowship. In short, there is a definite method to be followed. And if it is somewhat elaborate who will grudge the elaborateness if it ends in reality and rest?

First of all, 'a company of men and women meet together that they may seek that richer consciousness of God, and, with it, that clearer light upon truth or conduct, their need of which has been impressed upon them. The first requirement is that their power of receptivity shall be intensified. Of God's willingness to lead them there is no question. The only point of uncertainty is in their ability to discern and to respond to His direction. Therefore they will begin with earnest and united prayer. This prayer will not be hurried; it will be a sustained act of communion. And therein they will desire four things.'

'First, they will together wait in silence for a more vivid sense of God's Presence and Reality. In the strain and bustle of ordinary life the vision of the unseen may easily grow dim; they will tarry in stillness before God, craving the penitence and cleansing through which it may once more be made clear to them. Next, they will together pray for the coming of the Kingdom. This will be no light and easy intercession; they will reverently strive to view men from God's own standpoint, and, so far as may be, to enter into His sorrow for the world's sin and His sympathy with the world's need. And when they have thus learnt a little less imperfectly to see mankind as God sees it, alike in its transgressions and in its ultimate possibilities, they will at last be ready, in the third place, to ask for light on the particular matter in which they need the Divine illumination. They will therefore pray together that in this special situation God's own design may be made plain to them. Lastly, that all hindrance in themselves may be removed, they will seek, before they turn to examine the problem, to be freed from every form of self-assertion. In the consciously realized presence of God, and relying on His aid, they will try to expel from their minds all previous bias, all personal preferences and all self-seeking motives,

and at whatever cost, to will God's will both for themselves and for the world.'

Now in all this the one essential matter is that the prayer is offered in an atmosphere of fellowship. This has been found to be essential in experience. There are also good reasons for it. 'The group of men engaged is more than a mere collection of individuals; it is a body of believers—a small but essential section of that living organism which is the Church of Christ, Himself its living Head. On this account the entire spiritual efficiency alike of every part and of the whole is immeasurably increased. Because of its mystical union with its fellows and with the Head, each separate member acquires a power never possessed and never attainable in isolation. The prayer of each, his penitence, his consecration, his very experience of God's Presence, is deepened and enriched by those of all; and, in its turn, "through that which every joint supplieth" the entire body is itself built up in love.'

But fellowship in prayer is only the first part of the method. There must be also fellowship in deliberation. The men who have tried the method and found it workable are not quietists. They do not depreciate intelligence. They do not trust to vague and irrational impulses. 'We have met with no assemblies of men by whom the duty of sincere and resolute thinking is more clearly apprehended. True, their ultimate reliance is upon a wisdom higher than their own. Christ's promise that His Spirit shall guide them into all the truth they believe to be, not merely a beautiful ideal, but also a practical fact on which they may safely count. None the less, beneath this confidence in a heavenly guidance there dwells no lurking hostility to human reason. The inference drawn is rather that, since God has made us rational beings, it is through our minds that He will most naturally lead us. Therefore, prepared by united communion, they turn in their search for God's will to a frank and determined discussion.'

Then there is the third thing. It is the important part of the method. It is also the most difficult. Those men who meet for prayer and deliberation put away from them all self-assertion. Have they their own ideas about God's government? They set them aside. Have they prejudices in favour of 'particular providences'? Or against? They resolutely rid their minds of them. They are ready to revise all their earlier conclusions by any new light that God may reveal to them.

And here more than elsewhere appears the value of the fellowship. For 'no one man's mind, however cultivated and sincere, can perceive the whole truth, whether in relation to conduct or in relation to thought. As the physical light, falling on various objects, is reflected in various shades of colour, each but a partial presentation of its great original, so the light of truth, reflected from men's different minds, is found to exhibit many different aspects, in no single one of which can truth's perfect image be discerned. In the second case, as in the first, the pure white light is gained only when all these partial reflections are combined. Each individual's view needs to be checked and supplemented by the view of his fellows.

'It is not merely that no separate human being ever has attained a perfect wisdom; as a separate human being he never can attain it. He has been so made that he will find his fullest life only in fellowship with others—a fact which applies to his intellectual life as well as to life in all its other phases. As, then, he seeks to form right judgments, he has no power, even if he had the will, to be strictly independent. He was born a member of a body, and not even in his thinking has he the right to say to another, "I have no need of thee."

'That being the case, men who are seeking God's guidance in any given situation, and believe that their minds are the instruments through which He is wont to direct them, will be eager to welcome light from every possible angle. It will be assumed that no single point of view contains the whole

truth which God is waiting to reveal; and this will be acknowledged even by those among whom that point of view may be most strongly maintained. But it will also be assumed that every point of view adopted by an honest thinker will probably embody some aspect of the truth—an aspect which, however partial or exaggerated, yet cannot safely be neglected in the final synthesis; and this fact will be freely recognized even by those who regard that standpoint with the utmost initial prejudice. In other words, the path to truth, whether in thought or in action, lies along the line of accepting light from every quarter—even from that with which at first we have the least degree of sympathy—and in focussing these scattered rays into as real a unity as we are then able to attain.'

What is the result? The result is clear and definite guidance of God. 'Baldly stated in black and white, this truth may seem somewhat vague and unconvincing: experienced in actual practice, its impressiveness is at times almost startling, and some of its definite results have been remarkable. For when self-assertion has once been forsaken, and through its removal men's minds are at last made truly receptive, a very real and precious fellowship in thought is rendered possible. Mind acts freely on mind, each in its turn exploring, checking, challenging the other. The thought of each is quickened and stimulated. It rises to possibilities as yet unrealized in its moments of solitary activity. Exaggerations are corrected, deficiencies supplied, the sense of proportion duly adjusted. And in the process many earlier differences of view are found to disappear. A perceptible *rapprochement* is effected, and in the end a measure of agreement reached which at the outset would have appeared in the highest degree improbable. It is in this way that, as each individual thinker approaches nearer to a common centre, the wonderful phenomenon of *corporate thought* is experienced.' This corporate thought is thereupon accepted as the voice of God.

There are two subjects beyond all others (except the preaching of the gospel of the grace of God) to which we must now give ourselves. The one is the doctrine of the Future State. The other is the doctrine of God's Providence. And of these two the doctrine of God's Providence is the easier and the more urgent.

It is the more urgent. For the doctrine of Providence has to do with the things of this life, and even in Scripture the things of this life receive attention before the things of the life to come. And it is easier. For a true doctrine of God's Providence can be set forth in a single sermon, but it takes many sermons and much wisdom to set forth a strengthening doctrine of the Future Life.

The Rev. W. PERRY, B.D., Principal and Pantonian Professor of the Theological College of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, has written a book on *Providence and Life* (Edinburgh: Scottish Chronicle Press; 3s. 6d. net). It is a good guide to the preacher and sufficient for all suggestive purposes. But to set forth the true doctrine of God's Providence a single chapter in the book is sufficient—even a single incident in that chapter.

It is the incident of the healing of the epileptic boy. 'The scene so vividly described in the pages of St. Mark has received noble artistic expression at the hands of Raphael. In his familiar picture the canvas is divided into two parts across the middle. In the upper half is represented the Transfiguration—heaven open, and the Kneeling Christ glorified in the Light of the Eternal Father. In the lower half is depicted a miniature hell on earth, a gaping crowd surrounding a poor epileptic boy who is falling into one gruesome fit after another. Our Lord is the centre of the scene above; He is absent from the scene below. It is the disciples who are in the foreground there; but they stand utterly helpless before the object of piteous misery in front of them. The picture of human impotence is complete; the call for a quick descent of Divine power is imperious.'

It is the old question, you see—so old and yet so pitiably new. Why did God not stop the War? Why did God permit it to begin? Why did He allow so many men to suffer and die, so many women to suffer and live?

Well—'Into this scene of abject misery our Lord passes from His sojourn on the mount, and we might suppose that His first and sole concern would be to sweep out of sight this damning disproof of the goodness of God. But the instant He appears it is clear that His interest is concentrated not so much on the cure of the suffering boy as on the restoration and reinforcement of the father's faith. The latter is unconscious till the end, that he, not the boy, is the real patient. He pours out with no stint of detail the story of his child's symptoms. "He teareth him; and he foameth and gnasheth with his teeth and pineth away." His mind, indeed, seems to have room for nothing but the fearful effects of the disease; for, when questioned as to its duration, he begins all over again. "Ofttimes it hath cast him into the fire and into the waters to destroy him." Clearly, he is quite unconscious that anything is wrong with *him*.'

So were the men who fought the war for us. They were quite unconscious that there was anything wrong with *them*. They had not willed the war. They had not begun it. They were doing their utmost possible to end it. How could they think that anything was wrong with *them*?

But this man and the men who fought were at one in this: when the trouble came they went to the highest they knew for relief. Mr. Harrington Lees tells us that in a certain factory where complicated machinery is in use, the instructions given in the workrooms are, 'If your threads get tangled send for the foreman.' When the war and its hideousness became inexplicable the men in the trenches (some of them at any rate) sent for God.

In the volume entitled *The Army and Religion*, edited by Professor Cairns, this is quoted from one of the correspondents: 'I was sitting at a table one night drinking coffee and listening to the men talking of the fearful experiences out of which they had just come. And one man, evidently respected by the rest, said, "I bet you that there is not a man who was in Delville Wood that night who is an atheist." I did not say what I thought, though I confess I should have thought that Delville Wood was enough to make any man an atheist, and probably it and the like of it have darkened the lives of many. The men themselves had described it as "hell," which surely is the denial of God, and yet, curiously enough, here was a man challenging a dozen men around him that nobody who had been in Delville Wood could doubt God. I thought that perhaps it was just the sense of gratitude that he had come out of it safely that made him say it. So I said, "Why do you say that?" He replied, "There wasn't a man who didn't pray that night." "No," said another, "we all said our prayers that night." "Well?" I said, wanting him to go on. "Well," he added, "when a man does pray, it makes all the difference."'

The father of the epileptic sent for the foreman. 'I spake unto thy disciples that they should cast it out and they were not able.' But now, 'If *thou* canst do anything.'

It is the 'if' of distrust and failure. Our Lord throws it back on the suppliant—'If I can? If *thou* canst'—that is the condition. 'If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that "believeth."' And the man sees at last that in some way or other it does depend upon him. 'Lord, I believe,' he cries, 'help thou mine unbelief.'

'No longer,' says Canon Perry, 'does he plead for mere escape from misery through Divine power. His cry now is for that spirit which will sustain him in it. He understands that his own spiritual condition is of more consequence than his relief from trial. He has reached a new view of Christ and of the working of Providence.'

He has discovered that 'Christ's first concern is not the disappointments and misfortunes of life, but the men and women who are suffering from them.' God's responsibility for man is best discharged, not by taking the load from his shoulders, but by awaking and maintaining in him the faith and courage that will enable him to bear his own burden. To him that believeth all things are possible.'

Canon PERRY turns to Browning for confirmation. For 'Browning has made this aspect of human life the theme of much of his best writing. In the *Ring and the Book*, Pompilia, the child wife of Count Guido, is a mere puppet in the hands of a heartless fate, tossed from one misfortune to another, till at last she lies stabbed to death by the hand of her brutal husband. Yet in the midst of her misery she can say,—

"God for our good makes the need extreme,
Till at last He puts forth might and saves."

But He does not save, for Pompilia in the end is the victim of a foul murder. Still, "God for our good makes the need extreme," and the issue clears up the mystery; for, when Guido goes to his doom it is his dead wife's name that rises to his lips in his appeal for deliverance, and that appeal—"Pompilia, will you let them murder me?"—is also a proof that he, too, has at last found his soul.'

The greatest service yet rendered to the Church to equip her for the task to which she has been called by Field-Marshal Sir Douglas Haig, the task of reconstructing the shattered world, and so completing the work which the army by its victory began—the greatest service, we say, yet rendered is rendered by a volume which Messrs. Macmillan have published under the title of *The Army and Religion* (6s. net).

While the war was going on—it was sometime, we think, in 1916—a committee was formed for the purpose of eliciting from the officers and men engaged in it their attitude to Religion and the Church. A Questionnaire was prepared and widely circulated among them. 'Nearly three hundred memoranda, often of considerable length, resting on the evidence of many hundred witnesses, were thus obtained from men of all ranks, generals down to privates, chaplains, doctors, nurses, hut leaders and workers, and also from Committees appointed at the great Bases in England and France to collect evidence.' That mass of memoranda was then sifted and classified, and by means of that undaunted painstaking which is called genius this book was prepared and published.

The book has been edited, and for the most part written, by Professor David S. CAIRNS. That means something. It means that no sectional interest, either theological or ecclesiastical, will be allowed to disturb the balance of its truthfulness. And it means that it is literature.

The volume is divided into two parts. The first part contains the information regarding the religion of the army furnished by the Committee's many correspondents. The second part contains the comments and conclusions of Professor CAIRNS and his Committee upon that information. The information is quoted with admirable restraint and readableness. And it is quoted in sufficient and really final fullness. This is the first value of the book. Very many chaplains, doctors, officers of all ranks, and men of all arms, have already told us what they think of the Christianity that is professed in our land and of those who profess it. But it has been mere nibbling. Now we can say that if the mind of the British army is worth reaching it has been reached. If the beliefs or unbeliefs of those who won the war for us are to be of any service in the building of that Jerusalem in our pleasant land on which our hearts are so poignantly placed, those beliefs and also those unbeliefs are at last before us.

Here is a central sentence: 'As a whole they are religious, but not Christian.' It comes from a

Presbyterian chaplain. It refers to the men of a Scottish division. The chaplain goes on to explain: 'The men, as a rule, are not hostile to the Christian religion, but are rather indifferent. They regard it as impracticable and inefficient. Most of the men believe in God, but have only a fitful sense of their need of Him. It is His help they seek more than fellowship with Him. They do not realize as they ought their personal relationship to Jesus Christ. He appears to them rather as an historical figure than as a presence and power in their lives.'

That is not the worst of the story. It is nearly the best. From other divisions freely, and from Scottish divisions also, there comes the evidence of practical materialism, and still more of utter and almost impervious indifference. Says the editor: 'The greatly prevailing drift of the evidence is that the men as a whole take a material view of life.' And again: 'It is true that, under the present conditions, the men prevailingly appear to take a material as opposed to a spiritual view of life. In spite of all that has been said of the experiences of the Line, it would be a great misunderstanding of the situation to think of the mass of men as preoccupied with religion. This is what has made the highly-coloured pictures of a "revival of religion at the Front" so untrue and so pernicious. If we are basing our hopes for religion in the future on the idea that the men are going to set the Churches on fire with a new zeal for religion, we shall assuredly be disappointed. There will be a new and wonderful opportunity for reaching and deeply moving these men, which the Churches may see and use, but it is highly doubtful if there will be more. For our witnesses generally testify that, to all appearances, material interests have everywhere seemed to prevail over spiritual.'

The materialism is practical. It is not theoretical. 'All our accounts go to show that theoretic materialists are very few indeed.' Moreover, the materialism is on the surface. 'In the main,' says the editor, 'one gets the impression that there lies on the mind of the young manhood of our country a hard crust of materialism, beneath which there are great depths of idealism, of humanity, and of religion. The crust is strained and broken in great experiences. There comes to them some drastic summons to heroic sacrifice and daring, and in response to it there is an upheaval of latent spiritual power, and for the moment the commonplace, pleasure-loving man becomes a hero. He gives his life away for a spiritual end.'

It is so with the indifference also. Widespread as it is, and seemingly insurmountable, it vanishes as a cloud the moment the call comes to some great act of surrender or some high test of endurance. It is due to two almost universally prevalent and all-prevailing causes.

What are these causes? The inconsistent lives of Christian people is not one of them. Not a few of the men who went to the war went there with the belief that professing Christians were not better than others, and worse than others because of their profession. But the war destroyed that belief. The Christian officer or private was found to be all the better for his Christianity. He was as good a soldier and he was better as an officer or a comrade. What are the causes of the men's indifference to religion? Their ignorance of the Bible and misunderstanding of Christianity.

Ignorance of the Bible, that is to say, of the elementary facts and truths of religion, was found to be both widespread and abysmal. Misapprehension of the nature of Christianity was found to be almost universal and almost ineradicable. Take the latter alone.

Says this faithful reporter: 'There is no more startling fact revealed in the evidence than this, and certainly none that should more rouse the Churches to some sense of their own failures and shortcomings. What are they in the land for, except to manifest Christ to the mind and heart of

the nation? Why are they in the positions of vantage which they occupy, but for this end? If it is the definition of a saint that he is in the world to make it easier for other men to believe in God, is this not true of the Christian Church in even fuller measure? Yet after so many centuries we find this baffling ignorance. There is something here for us all to consider deeply.'

But just because it is ignorance Professor CAIRNS finds room for hope in it. For, as he says, 'there is a profound difference between ignorance and apostasy.' And 'a quarrel which rests upon a misunderstanding is much more easily healed than one which rests upon antagonism.' And he adds: 'Grave as the whole situation undoubtedly is, it would be incomparably graver were it not for the fact that at the heart of it there is this element of far-reaching misunderstanding. It is not claimed here that this is a misunderstanding of the Churches as they are. No doubt there is this also to some extent. But the point is that there is a deep and far-reaching misunderstanding of what the Christian revelation is, and an equally grave misunderstanding of the Christian life, and that this misunderstanding is one which it is the first duty of the Church to do all in its power to remove.'

How is the Church to do it? The answer is in the one word, *interpretation*. The truths of Christianity are there, and they are truths. But they need interpretation. They need such interpretation as shall make them intelligible to the minds of ordinary men. This demand runs right through the volume. Many of the officers see its necessity clearly, many of the men feel it dimly. At last the editor urges it with all the momentum of this vast mass of evidence behind him. What does he say?

'The whole life of the Church,' he says, 'depends on its fundamental faiths about God and the world and the soul, the Person and Work of Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Church, the Kingdom of God, and the Life to come. Now it is quite clear that this teaching, in spite of all that has been done by the ministry of the Church and by the various systems of religious education followed in the schools, has never been taken home as a whole by the great masses of the manhood of the country. They have taken home parts of it, or these have been revealed to them for the first time by the experiences of the war, but they are broken fragments without unity or cohesion.

'This is in large part due to the fact that most of the men have never really understood the things that they have been taught. Where the Christian doctrines have been taught they seem to have been taught as something out of relation to their lives, which has to be believed as a duty rather than as a revelation which makes reason of the riddle of human life. It is a very frequent thing in our evidence to find the need for "interpretation" insisted on, the explanation of what Christ and His salvation really mean. This implies that Christian truth is at present taught in a foreign tongue which has been learned by rote but never understood. Hence in the great convulsion of the war it has been simply dropped, as something quite without use, and out of all relation to the urgent facts, "just as on a forced march a Bible will be left out of a kit-bag by a man who does not understand and love it," or else retained only as a mascot.

'Now, if the present divorce is really to be overcome it is absolutely vital that this should be set right. We are here dealing with something which is fundamental. The Church will have to put its very heart and soul into the work of restating the great faiths by which it lives and from which it draws all its inspiration in terms which the men can understand. The frequent demand for "interpretation" is in truth a demand for the vitalizing of theology, for the restatement of Christian doctrines in terms of life.

'This is a very different thing from abandoning these truths in order to make the Faith plausible

and easy to believe, or to take a "greatest common measure" of the working faiths of existing Churches and men as representing essential Christianity. That would be almost as fatal as to lower the standard of Christian conduct in order to make it easier for men to practise. It would be the same kind of apostasy and have the same ruinous consequences. But the great Christian verities are so great that they have many aspects. Every one of them was revealed at the first in order to meet certain practical necessities. To-day every one of them is capable of being brought home to the mind of the simplest, if we can find the true points of contact with him.'

And then come these incisive words—for God's sake let us lay them to heart: 'The hardest and deepest thinking that the Churches can put into this matter is essential. The best men will not be put off with any superficial and *ad captandum* treatment. The sooner we realize that the men want thoroughness, reality, and candour, the better will it be for all. Perfunctory teaching by men who have never felt the cutting edge of the problem will be of no avail with the men who will really be the leaders of the generation after the war. Men who have seen their comrades dissolved by high explosives will want to know what are the reasons for believing in immortality, and what is their present state. Men who have lived in the shambles and putrefaction of the Salient and the trenches at Souchez will want to know how they can remember these things and believe in Almighty Love. They will want to know why prayer in danger gave them such intense relief, and why it seemed so often to be unanswered. They will probably give the Churches a chance again in order to see if they have anything vital and comprehensible to say. If they do not get it from professional teachers of religion, they will take their own road once more. We may be quite sure that most of them will not take their faith on mere authority, or be content with superficialities uttered by men who have never either in body or soul suffered along with them, or with them battled for faith in the wild revel of Sin and Death of these awful years.'

The Church's Message for To-day.

By the Reverend Archibald Henderson, D.D., Principal of the United Free Church College, Glasgow.

The question is being often asked, 'Have the divided branches of the Church of Christ no message which they can unite in delivering to this war-torn world?' Though they cannot agree as to the terms in which to express their Faith in Jesus Christ, and however differently they interpret their duty to Him, however imperfectly they fulfil it, they are at one in acknowledging Him as the risen and glorified Saviour, the Lord and Judge of all men. It is impossible for any who accept the authority of the New Testament to differ as to this. Some more constantly regard Him as the Prophet, others as the Great High Priest of His people; may not all at such a time as this unite to proclaim Him and to persuade the world to own Him as the King and Lord of all? It was revealed to the Seer of Patmos that it is the divine purpose which controls and triumphs through the wars and trials of this present world that there shall be established in it 'the salvation and the power and the Kingdom of our God, and the authority of His Christ.' This may seem a pithless commonplace not worth stating because every Christian allows it. But to allow it as a fact is not to accept it as the rule of life. It is well to remind ourselves at such a time of how it is the keynote of our Lord's last command to His Church: 'All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I

have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even to the consummation of the age.' His possession of an authority, from which nothing in heaven or on earth is exempted, is not only the ground on which our Lord commands His Church, but on which He requires that all nations of the earth shall be taught obedience to Him. And His presence every day with His disciples is not only for their guidance and support, but that they may call on all nations to acknowledge and serve Him as a present Saviour and Lord. That inevitably raises the question: Who is this who demands that all heaven and earth shall obey Him, 'whatsoever He commands'? The control of winds and sea is as nothing compared with such lordship, for it is 'far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age, but also in that which is to come' (Eph 1^{21}).

But our Lord puts recognition of Him, as invested with that authority in heaven and on earth, as the constant duty not only of His Church but of the whole world. Every creature is to learn who He is, and to be taught to keep all His commandments.

The value of His continual presence, even the possibility of it, depends on who He is; and to realize that we must have regard to His life in its eternal oneness. So He taught His disciples when He said, 'I came out from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world and go unto the Father,' and when in prayer to the Father he said, 'I have glorified Thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which Thou hast given me to do. And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with Thine own self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.' His life must be thus regarded in its completeness if we are to know Him, and to accept His universal authority. If we consider His life lived on the earth as all His history, it becomes for us a thing of the past; the wonder of His love vanishes if He did not become man and give His life out of love to save sinful and rebellious men; and the power of His Gospel would cease did He not live with authority over all flesh to forgive sin and to give eternal life. His life on earth was, He said, that His disciples should know Him, and in Him should see the Father; but what would that have profited for after generations if they could not as truly know Him for themselves? Is it conceivable that one without all authority in heaven and on earth could be the manifestation of God to men, or the fulfiller of His loving will to them? As Dorner expresses it, 'Christ Himself applies the fruit of His work to successive races of men and the individuals composing them. He is not shut off from this world of ours, remaining at a distance, but continues without intermission in an active relation to His Church during its temporal life, intervening in every moment of time. His love and His action renew their youth in time for every individual, for we who need reconciliation have our life in time. . . . His earthly sacrifice took place indeed but once, but once for all; for issuing from His eternal spirit it is the revelation of an undying love which proves its vitality by perpetually applying its earthly work. Thus He works out of His eternity, while living historically with His Church upon earth.'[1]

It may seem superfluous to emphasize such elementary truths, but no one acquainted with the literature of our time will question the need of their re-affirmation. Apart from hostile literature there is much that is, I believe, meant to be friendly and helpful that is not so, because it ignores the life of the Son of God that was before His self-manifestation on earth, and the divine glory of His present life at the right hand of the 'Father, the Lord of heaven and earth.' We are grateful to every one who enables us more worthily to realize Christ's life on earth; but we cannot regard Jesus Christ as but one of earth's great ones who by their deeds or teachings exercise a posthumous influence, but have no ever-present personal power or authority over their fellow-men. As Dr. Denney says in his last book, 'There is certainly no reconciliation but through the historical Christ; there is no other Christ of whom we know anything whatever. But the historical Christ does not belong to the past. The living Spirit of God makes Him present and eternal; and it is not from Palestine, or from the first century of the Christian era, but here and now, that His reconciling power is felt.'

In the apostolic history and epistles all authority and dominion and power are ascribed to Him—'He is Lord of all.' That is the vitalizing and sustaining truth which our Lord in His parting commission charged His Church to remember, but which, as history shows, it has been most ready to forget. Not in the first generations, to whom His

[1] *System of Christian Doctrine.*

promised presence was a living reality. He was king of their lives, with them all their days. Delitzsch notes that the 2nd Psalm is more frequently quoted in the New Testament than any other. In the early half of the second century, Aristides in his 'Apology' told the Roman Emperor that after Christ's ascension His apostles went unto all the provinces of the inhabited earth and taught His divine majesty (μεγαλωσύνη, cp. He 1^4 and 8^1).[1] But as time passed and Christ did not return, the power of the unseen lost hold of men; and, confronted with trials from without and strife with heresies within, the Church lost its realization of His promised presence. This is very strikingly manifest in the three great creeds, which, in practically identical terms, baldly state that the Lord Jesus Christ arose from the dead, 'ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, and from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.' No doubt the living and glorified Christ was the object of the Church's worship; it sang of Him as 'reigning from the Tree.' Its *Acta Martyrum* in recording their devotion to Christ in life and their fellowship in His death added to the imperial date of their martyrdom the triumphant words *regnante Jesu Christo.* But the silence of the creeds which left an unfilled period between the Ascension and His 'Parousia'—as if He were not with His people all these days—showed the loss of the Church's earlier realization of His presence. If the explanation is offered that the Church framed her earliest creed as her witness to historic fact against Docetism, and her later creeds against the metaphysical subtleties of unbelief, that but emphasizes the evidence that for the Church Christ's presence with her in power had ceased to be *the* fact on which her very life depended. And the after history shows the inevitable effects of this silence. Some went back to Christ's earthly life when He was visibly present, and built for themselves a faith on His teaching and His work on earth—a faith of the intellect rather than of the heart, dependent not on what Christ wrought in them, but what they did of themselves as His followers—a faith which gradually assumed to itself authority to dictate the only form of a saving belief. Others, regarding the coming of Christ's kingdom as impossible until He visibly returned in glory, discharged themselves from the obligation to obey His command to evangelize the world. To souls thus craving for a sensibly present and authoritative manifestation from heaven the Church offered itself, and was accepted to fill the place of the Unseen Lord in heaven.

To minister to the same desire the help of the artist was in the Middle Ages called in to picture Christ as He was imagined to have been seen in the days when He dwelt among men, from His birth to His Cross, and even in the bonds of death, thus to stimulate love and devotion to Him. But, as Westcott says, 'The Cross is the symbol not only of death but of triumph also. It has been indeed most disastrous for our whole view of the Gospel that a late age placed upon the Cross the Figure of the dead Christ and that we should have retained it there.' It is significant that a revolt against thus representing the Lord in weakness led to His being pictured as coming for Judgment, and peoples as fleeing before Him, and that representation again being met by representations in speech and art of His mother as intervening to avert His wrath. Faith in a Christ that died is not faith in a dead Christ; and faith in a coming Judge is not faith in any other than Him who died and lives to save, Him who is with us all the days, 'the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.' Yet through all the past of this Christian era there have been in every generation devout spirit-taught souls living in intimate fellowship with their unseen but not unknown Lord, themselves living witnesses to those around them to a living Christ.

The essential fact of the Reformation was that it brought Christ again before the view of the peoples of Europe. In our own as in other lands, men awoke, seeking to recover touch with some reality in religion. They knew they had lost God; they said that the Church had lost Him also; and while that great spiritual recovery was marred by human faults, and, because of these, suffered from divisions and decay, it retained the assurance of the supreme authority of Christ speaking to men in His word, and, by bringing men face to face with Christ as king, created in heart and conscience a very real sense of His immediate and absolute authority. The divine sovereignty of Jesus Christ was for them a reality. And with what soul-subduing reverence it filled them, what dauntless courage, what seriousness of purpose, what unconquerable freedom of conscience, what stoutness of

[1] 'Cambridge Text Studies,' vol. i. No. 1, p. 110.

heart against the world's temptations, what scorn of its lies and deceits, what triumphant superiority to the terrors of death—with what imperturbable calm it clothed them! All that you read of in ordinary histories; but the secret of it was that they were men whose eyes did see the King, the Lord of Hosts, and that by and for Him they lived.

And so the life that comes from the living Christ Himself, and from no other, is the demonstration to every age and to all nations of His supreme authority in heaven and on earth, even as He foretold when He commanded His disciples to teach all nations to keep all the things which He had commanded them; and had before promised: 'I will not leave you orphans: I am coming to you (every day). Yet a short time and the world beholdeth me no more; but ye behold me, because I am living, and ye shall be living. He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him.'

Thus is He to be taught to all nations as the living and loving Lord to be loved and obeyed—not, however, as in these days one reads and hears, as one set in contrast with an Almighty God for whom men have no desire or need.

There cannot be two supreme authorities in heaven and on earth. The kingdom of heaven is not divided against itself. All authority has been given to the exalted Christ that all should be brought into subjection under Him to the glory of God the Father. In Him men find a 'leader and commander' of whose authority there can be no question, and in whose loving friendship there is surest confidence—One whose word is with power to enable them to render the obedience it commands. Let none, therefore, be too greatly concerned because many seeking a Captain of Salvation turn from the churches. The purest church cannot be to them the Christ they seek; if they surrender their hearts to Him to keep whatsoever He commands, they will not be long in joining the ranks of those who love and serve Him also. Let the churches cast away every enfeebling fear and restraining form, and proclaim joyously a triumphant and all-conquering Christ as Lord of all, and willing peoples shall gather to His power. Above all other means let them, by all their members, exhibit the saving and renewing power of Christ's service in their lives and they will recruit their tens of thousands.

Professor Case of Chicago closes his recent informing book on *The Evolution of Christianity* with these words: 'In the last analysis Christianity owed its triumphs to the activity of loyal individuals who not only answered the call of God as they heard it in their own lives, or discerned it in the pages of history, but who learned, consciously or unconsciously, to read the divine will in the signs of the times. They were sensitive to the religious forces within their environment, and so drew inspiration from its life and responded to its needs by conserving, heightening, and supplementing current religious values. Under the guidance of these individuals the genius of the new religion is disclosed in their expanding life. If Christians to-day would be true successors of those ancient worthies, they, too, must make religion an affair of life and growth commensurate with the needs of the present generation.'

'Signs of the times' are not wanting surely in the dissatisfaction and unrest of a world conscious of its emptiness and crying for reality in religion, in the gathering of nations from all ends of the earth in recognition of the brotherhood of peoples great and small, in defence of truth and right, of humanity and freedom. It is true these include nations which do not acknowledge Christ as King; but they have acknowledged that law which He has written on their hearts, and to which He appealed.

This is not only a sign of readiness in obedience to divine ideals and a promise of better things for some league of nations—which if it is to have any real and increasing power must be based on moral authority—it is a summons to the Church to arise and go forth to all nations with the Gospel of Christ's kingly authority in heaven and on earth to teach them to keep whatsoever He has commanded, assuredly seeing that He is Himself working by His spirit within them and is drawing them to Himself.

There are signs of the times demanding of the divided churches consideration of their relation to one another as that affects their relation to the world. 'The sole Kingship of Christ,' Dorner wrote fifty years ago, 'is, first of all, the true foundation of the unity of the Church; for that unity sufficiently exists where, and so far as, all submit themselves to His leading, His will as expressed in

word and sacrament. No less is it the true foundation of the freedom of the Church, for example, in relation to the State, which has no authority over its principle.' It is impossible for the divided branches of the Church to ignore and disobey the call for unity. And as it is their duty to learn from all that goes on before their eyes under Christ's government in the world, they may surely in these days take a lesson as to the value in spiritual as in earthly warfare of 'Unity of Command.' And herein they have the peculiar advantage that there can be no other King but Him unto whom, for His Church's sake, has been given all authority in heaven and on earth. The Church must recover the loyal reverence of her first days for the supreme authority of the ever-present Lord if she is to teach the nations to observe all that He has commanded.

Literature.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

James Hope Moulton, by his Brother (Sharp; 5s. net). It is not a long biography, but it is enough. Every word is well chosen. A truly great man is made known to the world—a scholar, a gentleman, a saint.

Three personal characteristics are singled out—his humility, his moral passion, and his ministry of reconciliation. His ministry of reconciliation was exercised (1) between Scholarship and Evangelism; (2) between Churches; (3) between Religions; and (4) between Men of all Types. Then this is quoted from Professor Peake's appreciation in the *Classical Review*: 'Straight, clean, magnanimous, generous, unselfish, and free from littleness and jealousy, he was a friend and colleague in whom one could wholly trust; virile in character and of irreproachable integrity, he was womanly in his tenderness, full of sympathy for the suffering and gentleness to the weak. His ample and varied learning raised no barrier between him and the illiterate, and the ministry he delighted to render them was neither spoiled by condescension nor chilled by aloofness. He could, and sometimes did, hit hard in controversy, but never below the belt. He had, like the rest of us, his intellectual limitations. In his case it was especially his unsympathetic attitude towards philosophy, and perhaps one might add an occasional tendency to fancifulness in his treatment of history. But his range was wide, and on his own ground he was a great master.'

Most men are content to overtake one department of knowledge. Two studies supremely attracted Moulton—the Grammar of New Testament Greek and the Religion of Zoroaster. And he mastered both. For 'thoroughly' was his motto from his schooldays till his death.

We congratulate the biographer on a most readable biography. There is much about Deissmann in it, which shall be passed over. But this of Deissmann's about the first volume of the *New Testament Grammar* may be quoted: 'The notion that a grammar can only be solid if it is tedious, is altogether destroyed by these Prolegomena. One can really *read* Moulton; we are not stifled in the dense atmosphere of exegetical wranglings, nor drowned in a flood of quotations. Everywhere the main facts and the main problems are keenly perceived and clearly formulated.' Elsewhere the editor himself says: 'Perhaps there was nothing which astonished the outsider more than the fact that J. H. Moulton's work was always interesting and usually piquant. To adapt the famous phrase of Junius, learning and dullness have so often and so long been received for synonymous terms that the reverse of the proposition has grown into credit, and every man who makes himself interesting to the crowd is taken to be one of little learning. It was no small achievement of my brother's that he made it clear that the profoundest scholarship could be expressed in a form which was interesting and arresting.'

This was one of the services which James Hope Moulton rendered to his day and generation.

LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

It is a terrible commentary on the sectarianism of the Church that a history of *The Evolution of Latin Christianity* can be written by so able and

accomplished a Professor of Ecclesiastical History as the late Dr. James Heron of Belfast, and be throughout a story of departure from the first faith and perversion of the first principles of Christ. Professor Heron lived in an atmosphere of antagonism — antagonism to a dominant and possibly domineering Roman community. When he lectured on the history of the Church he could not get away from that atmosphere. The consequences of the selfish sectarianism of the Roman Church were under his eyes every day. It was impossible that he should speak dispassionately of 'evolution' as if it were natural. He spoke passionately. He lectured, not on the Church, but on the corruptions of the Church.

Take one paragraph. Its topic is 'Amulets and Charms.'

'There was about the same time another outbreak of superstition in the widespread recourse to amulets and charms. Reference has been made already to the seamless, holy coat of Treves, which in 1845 was exhibited in that ancient city by the Roman Catholic bishop, which drew thither, it is stated, nearly two millions of pilgrims, and cured the grand-niece of the Bishop of Cologne of knee-joint disease. Carefully examined, the "holy coat" proved to be a bit of the grey woollen wrapping of a costly silk Byzantine garment. But no amulets were thought to be more effective than certain "scapulars," or pieces of woollen cloth worn on the shoulders underneath the clothes. Different orders adopted different colours. The Carmelites had a brown, the Trinitarians a white, the Theatines a blue, the Servites a black, and the Lazarites a red scapular. A tract published by episcopal authority at Münster in 1872 gave assurance that any one who wore the five scapulars would share in all the graces and indulgences that belonged to them severally. The Carmelite scapular appears to have been specially efficacious, and would have been invaluable in the present war, for it was impenetrable to bullets, impervious to daggers, stilled stormy seas, extinguished fires, made falls harmless, and healed disease. Instead of scapulars the Benedictines offered Benedict-medals, which, according to a tract of 1876, cured sickness, relieved toothache, stopped bleeding at the nose, overcame the craving for strong drink, warded off evil spirits, tamed skittish horses, cured sick cattle, and killed the blight on vines. Great miracles of healing and protection were attributed by the Jesuits to "the holy water of St. Ignatius and St. Xavier," the sale of which was most lucrative. The blood of St. Januarius, a martyr of the time of Diocletian, liquefies three times a year at Naples, and is found a great specific and effective antidote against earthquakes. It is an inestimable boon to the clergy.'

The book is published by Messrs. James Clarke & Co. (10s. 6d. net).

A HOUSE OF LETTERS.

'*A House of Letters:* Being Excerpts from the Correspondence of Charlotte Jerningham (the Hon. Lady Bedingfield), Lady Jerningham, Coleridge, Lamb, Southey, and Others, with Matilda Betham. The Period is from 1776 to 1850, and many of the quieter, yet attractive Aspects of English Life, as it then was, are apparent in this "House"—Edited by Ernest Betham' (Jarrolds; 5s. net). That is the whole title of a curious book which makes its appeal at first only to the curious in heart, but afterwards to the lover of good women even when gossipy. The letters from the Honourable Lady Bedingfield are very many and very gossipy. What we look for with disappointment is the letters of Matilda Betham in reply, for surely they were the flower of the gossipy letters of the day. How otherwise would all these women speak so enthusiastically of them and long so passionately for the next of their number?

But the book makes its appeal also to the lover of literature and great authors. For letters are here from Coleridge, from Charles Lamb, from Mary Lamb, and from Southey. Southey gives advice. Thus: 'Very glad should I be if I could point out to you any profitable employment in literature; but they who know most of such things best know how exceeding difficult this is. Nothing is so likely to succeed as a dramatic attempt, and I should think it very possible you might adapt some of our old plays to the stage. Of these the emolument would be considerable. Next to this the most promising attempt would be to versify some popular tale; better still, to manufacture one with a melodrama or grand spectacle for the stage.'

Then there are vivid descriptions of public events. Most vivid of all is the account of the riots in Derby and its neighbourhood in 1831, when the Reform Bill was thrown out. There is

also much information about the Bethams, with portraits of some of them.

REDEMPTION.

A volume with the title of *Redemption: Hindu and Christian* has been added to the series entitled 'The Religious Quest of India' which is edited by Dr. J. N. Farquhar and Dr. H. D. Griswold (Milford; 10s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. Sydney Cave, D.D. The series to which it belongs has now gone so far, and every volume has been so rigorously edited, that a new volume can be taken on trust. If it were not excellent it would not be there. And since the format—the whole literary 'get-up'—of the volumes reveals the Oxford University Press at its best, a new volume found lying on the table is one of the exquisite pleasures of life.

The writers write for India. The enterprise is a great effort, the idea of a consecrated and masterly mind, to offer the Gospel of the Grace of God to the educated Hindu, not in the spoken words of a missionary, which he may hear and he may not, but in modern English literature, such literature as it is his pride to be conversant with. It is possible that the editors may never see the fruit of their labours, but their labours will bear fruit in time, and, we firmly believe, abundantly.

Dr. Cave's subject is Karma. And Karma is great enough to be the subject of such a volume as this. He prepares for it, first by a discussion of the possibility of an absolute religion and the right of Christianity to the name, then by a sufficiently thorough and restfully reliable description of Hinduism, as it is found in its literature. The second part of the book is occupied with a direct and detailed contrast between Hinduism and Christianity as religions of redemption.

Like the other books of the series, this book is written for India, but to the student of religion—to the lover of the Lord everywhere—it is a great delight. Here, for example, is a word on Karma that is also a word of encouragement to the Christian evangelist: 'To the doctrine of *karma* may be not unjustly assigned the static nature of Indian society. When Christian missionaries began their work among the outcastes, they were told their work would be in vain; the ignorance, degradation, and semi-servitude of those for whom they laboured were the inevitable and inexpugnable results of past sins done in previous lives. Experience teaches; and the Hindu view has been found false in fact. The large, and long-established, Christian communities of South India have revealed how effectively Christian education can break the power of an evil past. Thus very many of the Shānar Christians have shown themselves well able in intellectual ability to compete with the privileged Hindus of the highest castes, and even among the Pariah Christians there are increasingly those of Christian character, education, and refinement. Defective environment provides a more adequate explanation for the degradation of the outcaste than does the law of *karma*, and experience shows how greatly spiritual forces working in an improved environment can change men even in their present life. Through the success of Christian missions and in emulation of them, Hindus have begun to realize their responsibility for those whom they formerly regarded as outside the pale of sympathy and help.'

PSYCHOLOGY IN THE PULPIT.

Psychology is not a new discovery. Our fathers, in the pulpit and out of it, did take some account of the personality of those with whom they had to do. They knew that there was emotion in men, and will, and even intellect. The great preachers went so far as to adapt their message to the comprehension though not to the convenience of their hearers.

But it is quite true that psychology was not taught to the preacher. If not in the pulpit, it is a discovery in the classroom. And Dr. Charles S. Gardner, Professor of Homiletics and Sociology (observe the combination) in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, is the first to write a systematic book on *Psychology and Preaching* (Macmillan; $2 net).

The subject is coming. Into the theological classroom it is coming. Perhaps we shall one day hear that august apartment called the theological and psychological classroom. For in the future it is quite certain that the study of man will find a place in the training of the preacher beside the study of God. It is quite certain that the one study will be counted as important for the preacher as the other.

So there is a fine opportunity for Professor Gardner's book. It is a pioneer's product. But

it will open the way to a more scientific and better method of teaching men how to persuade other men.

THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN.

The Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury has now issued a Report on *The Ministry of Women* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net). It is a large volume, for it contains not only a history of this ministry from Apostolic times till now (which is the Report), but also sixteen appendixes, which are separate articles written by special students of particular periods or points, and fifteen collotype illustrations.

The Report is purely historical. The Appendixes also are nearly confined to history. Once or twice the authors venture on interpretation or even prophecy. But the time is evidently not considered ripe for legislation on the subject or even for proposals toward legislation—at least so far as the Church of England is concerned.

A knotty problem was assigned to Miss Alice Gardner, the only woman whose name appears on the Committee. It is the explanation and adaptation of St. Paul's words on women. How does she meet the difficulty of the Apostle's command to women to keep silence and remain veiled?

'The whole passage,' she says, 'teems with difficulties; the argument seems irrelevant, and reminds one of the many times in which the inferiority of the female mind or the female character has been thrust in our teeth as an argument against any step towards female improvement or scope for exercise of such faculties as we have. The reference to "nature" is also familiar to us, and it is strange to see that "nature," probably moulded by the accompanying determinate "custom," dictated to later Jews a diametrically opposite practice, since at the present day, in acts of domestic worship, women stand bare-headed while men put on their hats; and surely it is very much like a bull to say in the same letter that a woman may not "prophesy," and that when she does so, it must be with head veiled. Of course, there is the possible hypothesis that St. Paul would let her teach—veiled—in private, but I think the connexion shows that he is thinking of public assemblies. However, one does not like, in trying to understand so great a mind as that of St. Paul, to be over-critical as to consistency. We know that he generally dictated his letters, and this fact seems to account for some of his involved sentences and for an occasional want of sequence, or oblivion of what has been said before. I should imagine the case to have been thus: Greek cities were, we know, liable to tumult and disorder in the popular assemblies, and Corinth was probably as bad as any other. The Christians had changed their former standard of conduct—though even there individuals were apt to lapse—they had not suddenly changed their manners, and their meetings were not patterns of decorum. Occasionally two or three would speak at once. Some would indulge in ecstatic sounds that nobody could understand. Others, in partaking of the love-feast, would drink to intoxication. And some women would throw aside the veil, worn by every reputable Greek lady on serious occasions, and, losing self-control, rave around, and with their shrill voices shriek the others down. Some one told St. Paul, and he determined to go to the root of the mischief: "These women must be kept down; they are forgetting their proper place. If they speak at all, let them at least be decently veiled." Then, after an interval: "You want to know my rules for women: I say they have no business to speak at all; they make the confusion worse." Yet he might not have intended, in cold blood, to stop the speaking of respectable and capable women altogether. Surely if Priscilla were there, with some strange new light on the relation of the Old Dispensation to the New, or Phœbe, on her return from Rome, with wonderful experiences to tell, would it not be to "quench the Spirit" and to "despise prophesyings" if one refused them a hearing? And women of their calibre would not be likely to set at naught the rules of propriety. I am not quite sure whether St. Paul would really allow us to interpret his meaning as: "Don't let women speak unless they have really got something to say, and in that case let them clothe and behave themselves with a view to ordinarily accepted decency." Certainly the later interpretation of his view is harsher than this, but I am not sure that it is more exact.'

SCOTTISH HISTORY.

Scottish History is best read in snippets. Or, if you think the word contemptuous, say 'in short

measures' after Ben Jonson. For the incidents which make up the History of Scotland—it is all made up of incidents—are truly not contemptible. There are a few of them, like the Raid of Ellem, that are of a humorous insignificance. But from contempt they are rescued one and all by the chivalry that prompted them. What was Flodden Field but a deed of chivalry? And Scottish History is full of such deeds—many of them, alas! fatal and lamentable.

That is why no one can read a History of Scotland. You have tried Fraser Tytler. You have tried Hill Burton. You have tried Andrew Lang. You have tried Hume Brown. One man we know did get through Hume Brown's three volumes, but he laid the last volume down both in sorrow and in anger. The way to read the History of Scotland is to read books like those which Louis A. Barbé writes, and especially the book he has most recently written: *Sidelights on the History, Industries, and Social Life of Scotland* (Blackie; 10s. 6d. net).

You certainly will not weary of it. It is half biographical and half industrial, but it is all entertaining. Read 'Food Control in Olden Times,' and be both entertained and made thankful. Read 'The White Rose of Gordon,' and discover the romantic in the character of that mean mortal called Henry VII. Read any chapter you please, and be pleased beyond expectation.

TELEPATHY.

Messrs. George Bell & Sons have published a volume by Frances Swiney to which the author has given the title of *The Ancient Road, or the Development of the Soul* (12s. 6d. net). It is a large book closely printed, and it is not to be read at a gallop. If there is in it that which the author believes to be in it—a new statement on scientific and verifiable lines of the nature and destiny of the soul of man—then it will be worth one's while to spend a winter month over it. Less than that will scarcely do.

This quotation will give some idea of the wealth of its contents and the vigour of its style, and with that we shall at present be content:

'We will now pass on to the various latent powers of the mind waiting to be awakened, stimulated, and developed for new spheres of usefulness. The super-sense of telepathy is now recognized scientifically; but from the earliest records of mankind there have been traditions of its existence, and we now know the old races, the primitive peoples, exercised it to a degree hardly conceivable to our dulled Western senses. The bazaar reports of India and Africa, which to the amazement of Europeans give accounts of events long before any known method of communication could have been utilized, originate in telepathic transmission of thought waves to certain persons capable of receiving them, and they in turn make the knowledge obtained known, if advisable, to the crowd. A case in point. When Lord Mayo was murdered in the Andaman Islands the crime was known in the Madras and Calcutta bazaars hours before the first telegrams arrived giving the official report. Again, when the first telegraph station was opened with much *éclat* in India at the native town of False Point, and the first telegraphic message was received from Calcutta, to which the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province sent a reply to the Viceroy, the answer of a native Rajah to the query, if he did not consider the invention of telegraphy marvellous, was another question—"Why use wires? We, in India, do without them." Our modern methods appeared clumsy, slow, and inefficient to this child of nature, whose ancestors, through untold ages, had developed nature's unseen forces. Telepathy is a power of the soul, a mental telegraphy of incalculable importance in the future. It is potent with immense good in the psychic advancement of mankind. For—given that it is a pure mental activity, independent of sight, sound, or touch, and not limited by space—we have in telepathy a force transcending and not subject to the three-dimensional plane. Thought is thus free of physical limitations, and is the tool with which the soul can work on the spiritual plane. It is, in fact, soul intercommunication through the medium of the universal mind-substance. It is thought-energy above light, heat, and sound vibrations. Telepathy gives us the key to the unspoken word, to the direct impact between the higher inspirational power and the mortal mind capable of receiving the divine message. The prophet spoke as he was *moved* by the Holy Spirit, by the Divine Mind in the etheric undulations of the infinite. When one considers that every brain-cell is in constant movement, and every thought, of the most ordinary kind, accelerates that movement by discharge of energy,

it becomes only a question of will-power how far and upon what subject that thought shall be directed and become actually objective to a receptive mind. This thought-force can be developed consciously. It should not be left to odd chances and unpremeditated coincidences; but it must be trained and guided, so that intercommunication may be rendered possible between kindred minds independent of physical or mechanical means, and quite irrespective of intermediate distance. We can thus realize how thoughts of love, consolation, help, encouragement, could encircle the globe. How those dearest and nearest, though separated by continents and oceans, may yet be brought within hail, so to speak, and spirit hold communion with spirit.

"Star to star vibrates light; may soul to soul
Strike through some finer element of her own?"'

CHARLES WESLEY.

It is a curious experience when one takes up a book without expectation and finds oneself caught by it. One reads on and on, always intending to lay it down, but never able to break the spell. One feels that the time might have been spent more profitably on things which were less familiar, but profit has had to give way before pleasure.

This has been our experience with a study of *Charles Wesley* by D. M. Jones (Skeffingtons; 7s. 6d. net). Whether it is the universal fascination of the soul of man in its struggle with circumstance, or simply the special quality of this author's literary ability, certain it is that the story of Charles Wesley's life as it is told in this book has completely captured our attention, and given us one long evening's undisturbed enjoyment.

Is it a common experience or only a personal peculiarity, that the life of Charles Wesley is more intimately interesting than the life of his brother? Why is it so to anyone? To answer that John was 'too great and good for human nature's daily food' is to talk nonsense. For the best of all is the most delightful. Is it that the 'principalities and powers' which St. Paul says that we have to wrestle with were more numerous and the issue of the long wrestling more uncertain in the life of Charles? Or is it simply that John's character had the simplicity of the heroic, while the career of Charles had the perplexity and the unexpectedness of the artistic?

THE REDEMPTION OF RELIGION.

Mr. Charles Gardner loves an enigmatic title. His book on Blake (the revelation of Blake to some men) he called *Vision and Vesture.* His estimate of Christianity he calls *The Redemption of Religion* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). He has written the book to tell the world what it may still believe about Christ and Christianity after all that has been done by the criticism of the last thirty years.

Now it will not be denied that the value of such a work will depend on its author's attitude to Christ. What does Mr. Gardner think of Him?

He thinks Him a man and no more than a man. A fallible man, to boot. 'We may be thankful that for many the infallible Church and infallible Book have passed, but there remains another which Christians are naturally loath to touch—the infallibility of Christ. That too must go. Yet in denying infallibility to Christ there is no implicit denial of His moral perfection or the perfection of His spiritual vision. Moral perfection transcends mechanical infallibility, and spiritual vision that would express itself is necessarily limited by the time-vesture with which it clothes itself. "He grew in wisdom." Let us frankly recognize this fact. Our love cannot be shaken, and when our worship is purged of fetichism, we shall see Him as He is, and that vision will ensure the oneness of our freedom, our worship, and our love.'

The words of Christ are not to be accepted because they are the words of Christ. 'The utterances of the loftiest prophet—even of Jesus Himself, be it said with all reverence—are to be retained as the word of God only when they withstand the searching test of history and many centuries of human experience.'

Yet He could work miracles. Even the miracle at Gadara (as the place is called) is taken to be actual. But 'there are two orders of miracle. The deeds of man's will, when completely freed, are miraculous, like the mighty works of Jesus; and the breaking of the transcendental world into the natural world involves miracles like the Virgin birth of Jesus, for it is the assertion of God's free will.'

Jesus could work miracles, then. But He was still only human, and when He died it was as a disappointed and deserted man. 'At three o'clock the soul of Jesus sank into a horror of great darkness. His faith in His Messianic calling, always difficult, had been helped by the faith of His disciples. Now they had forsaken Him, and He was left alone against the world, which was casting His claim in His teeth with scornful unbelief. What if they were right and He was wrong? What if His ministry from the beginning was the outcome of complete illusion, and this was the end of His ghastly failure? Tortured in body, He could not disentangle the illusory element in His message, and, sinking into darkness, He cried with a loud voice: My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?'

Yet Jesus rose again from the dead. How? Not as the Church has believed, still less as the rationalist has believed. 'There is a present inward resurrection which involves a future outward one. Jesus Himself was conscious of living in the power of the present inward resurrection, and therefore, believing that the Kingdom was on the eve of its manifestation, He could say confidently to His disciples that if He was rejected and put to death, He should certainly rise again in the coming Kingdom. His repeated assertion of His immediate Resurrection afterwards crystallized into the still more definite assertion that He rose again the third day.'

Here then is an author who comes to a study of the Gospels certainly without any theological prepossession, with a determination rather that dogma shall have no dominion over him, and what does he find? He finds that in all essential things the interpretation of the Church is the right interpretation. For with the utmost effort to discover only a human Christ he is compelled to acknowledge that the Gospels offer us words and works and a personality beyond the attainment and beyond the reach of any mere man. It is a most significant fact.

Will any one ever come again with so fresh a book on the prophets as Riehm? Perhaps no one. At least to us of our day it does not seem possible that again such a revolution can take place in the study of prophecy as that which was brought about by the change of the prophet from foreteller to forthteller, simple and inevitable as it now appears. But, as the Dean of Westminster said in his article 'Thirty Years Ago,' there is much to be done yet in the way of making public and popular that knowledge of the Old Testament which scholars have made ours. And Mr. John Godfrey Hill, Professor of Religious Education in the University of Southern California, for one, has accepted the high vocation. His book on *The Prophets in the Light of To-day* (Abingdon Press; $1.25) is written with the authority of an expert and yet with all the abandon of a popular preacher. To the Sunday School teacher the reading of this book will be as the opening of the eyes upon a new and glorious world where God is.

How seriously, how scientifically, is the teaching of religion taken in America. In Northwestern University there is a Professor of Religious Education, by name George Herbert Betts. Professor Betts has written a book—a large, full, systematic book—on *How to Teach Religion* (Abingdon Press; $1 net). It is nothing short of a revelation. It is nothing short of a revolution. Where is the Sunday School teacher with his 'Notes' and 'Anecdotes,' and without even a Dictionary of the Bible to keep him right? He and Professor Betts belong (or ought to belong) to different centuries.

Take the matter of *attitudes*. Where is the Sunday School teacher who ever troubled his head about attitudes? Yet to Professor Betts the creation of an immediate set of attitudes to the school and its work, and then of a far-reaching set of attitudes for the future life of the pupil, is a matter of supreme importance. He gives himself to it with the ardour of a great artist. With him the chief business is not getting the child into the school but getting him out of it. Does he leave with an interest in the Bible; with a right conception of God? Is his attitude to religion a sympathetic attitude? His whole future life will depend upon it.

And further: '"Are my pupils developing a *growing* interest in religion? Do they increasingly find it attractive and inspiring, or is religion to them chiefly a set of restraints and prohibitions? Do they look upon religion as a means to a happier and fuller life, or as a limitation and check upon life? Is religion being revealed to them as the pearl of great price, or does it possess but little value in their standard of what is worth while?"

These questions are of supreme significance, for in their right answers are the very issues of spiritual life for those we teach.'

We hear much of Memorials of the War. Messrs. George Allen & Unwin have published a volume which every man and woman who has any interest in memorials should obtain, recognizing in it a more useful and lasting memorial than any of brass or stone. It is a collection of *Documents and Statements relating to Peace Proposals and War Aims* (*December 1916–November 1918*). It is issued with an Introduction written by Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson (8s. 6d. net).

The first document is Bethmann-Hollweg's Peace Note of December 12, 1916. That is followed by the German Note to the Pope of the same date. It ends with President Wilson's Note to Germany of November 5, 1918. All the foreign documents have been translated into English.

Truth is a fine courageous title for a book. Sir Charles Walston has chosen it (Cambridge: at the University Press; 5s. net). Does it remind you of Mr. Labouchere? Well, let it do so. This man also has the desire to know the truth and to make it known, and he has the determination.

We are as a nation far from the truth at present. But some are farther than others. And Sir Charles Walston criticizes most severely the Politician, the Millionaire, and the Professional Journalist, because they tell most lies and most successfully. The millionaire, poor man, has much to answer for, even if he is nothing but a millionaire. But when the millionaire is also a professional journalist, for him assuredly the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched. For this is to Sir Charles Walston the unpardonable sin—to have the opportunity of using wealth for the suppression of the truth and to use it without ruth or repentance.

To a volume of short essays Mr. Gilbert Thomas has given the title of *Things Big and Little* (Chapman & Hall; 5s. net). And he does so no doubt to warn us that his big things may be our little things and his little things our big. For there is no standard of size as there is of holiness. Would you call Prayer a big thing? Somewhat unexpectedly there is 'A Word on Prayer' in the book. It falls between the chapter 'On a Certain Newspaper' and the chapter called 'A Holiday Reflection.' First there is a reference to the *Daily News* correspondence of some years ago, from which 'one gained the impression that Prayer was merely a sort of telegraphic communication between ourselves and a God Who sat somewhere in the clouds, holding in His hands a thousand wires, and ready at our request to bestow upon us those things which we desired for our greater physical security and happiness. Heaven was, apparently, a glorified General Stores.' Then there is a recommendation of George Meredith as an authority on Prayer. 'George Meredith, while by common consent among the greatest and best of men, did not conform to many of the general acceptances of the Christian faith. Yet it is, possibly, to him that we may look for some of the truest and noblest utterances upon the subject of Prayer. "Prayer," said he, "for material things is worse than useless; prayer for strength of soul alone avails." And again: "Prayer is that passion of soul which catches the gift it seeks." These, quoted from memory, may not be the exact words, but they are substantially correct; and, though we may resent the dogmatism of the first clause, and prefer to keep for ourselves an open mind as to whether petitions for material things are ever directly answered, it does seem to me that Meredith raises the whole conception of Prayer into a higher, fuller and rarer atmosphere.'

Who is the most popular preacher in London now? If the ninety-fifth volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net) is to be accepted in evidence, it is Dr. Fort Newton of the City Temple. But perhaps the editor does not mean to settle the question, and has chosen nine sermons by Dr. Newton to one by Dr. Jowett for other reasons. There are four fine sermons by the Rev. T. F. Harkness Graham, B.D., of Laurieston Parish Church, Glasgow, and there are four by the Dean of St. Paul's. One of Dean Inge's sermons is on Immortality. His great argument is that 'the spiritual life revealed to us by Christ has the quality of everlastingness. We feel that it is so just so far as we enter into it. The joy that it gives is the joy that no man can take from us. The love of Christ is a love from which neither death, nor life, nor any created thing can separate us. Jesus Christ is the Resurrection and

the Life. Those who have been baptized into His Spirit have found in Him the bread of life and the water of life, the secret nourishment which, in the favourite metaphor of the Greek Fathers, is the denizen of immortality, the food of the everlasting life. Since the incarnation of the Son of God it is impossible for us to think so meanly of human life as to believe that in this life only we have our hopes.'

Messrs. Constable have published a new translation of Jacob Böhme's *Six Theosophic Points* (10s. 6d. net). The translation has been made by Mr. John Rolleston Earle, M.A. It has been made with some skill as well as loyalty. For the very atmosphere of the original is retained, although the language is modern English. Mr. Earle has neither reproduced the German idiom with slovenly literalness, nor has he sought the semblance of antiquity by using the language of the Authorized Version. This is Böhme as nearly and as acceptably as he is likely to be offered to the present generation.

Mr. Earle has translated not only the 'Six Theosophic Points,' but also the 'Six Mystical Points,' the work 'On the Earthly and Heavenly Mystery,' and the work 'On the Divine Intuition.' They are all comprehended in this volume.

'The Watchwords of Methodism' (Epworth Press)—this is the very latest 'series.' It is a series of small books, published at two or three pence each, setting forth the ideals for which Methodists live. Dr. J. Scott Lidgett writes on *The Kingdom of God*, Dr. H. Maldwyn Hughes on *The Meaning of the Atonement*, the Rev. R. Winboult Harding, B.D., on *Fellowship*, and the Rev. H. Bisseker, M.A., on *Discipleship*.

Look for a moment at the last. The marks of Discipleship are Love, Self-renunciation, Fruitfulness, and Courage. Why not Meekness? Because Meekness is included in courage, its very finest flower. It takes more courage to hold one's hand than to strike. There were no meeker men than the first disciples, yet the priests and rulers 'beheld the boldness of Peter and John.'

One of the men who have really thought out the question of housing and have brought to it a mind in touch with Christ, is Mr. Will Reason, M.A. His *Homes and Housing* (Memorial Hall; 1s. net) is the last authoritative and wholesome word on the subject.

The Editor of the 'Christian Revolution' Series, whoever he may be, has chosen his authors well. The first volume was reviewed recently. The second is *The Open Light* (Headley; 4s. 6d. net). It is further described as an Enquiry into Faith and Reality. The author is the Rev. Nathaniel Micklem, M.A., Tutor and Chaplain at Mansfield College, Oxford.

It is a volume of apologetic. If that looks like the faint praise which damns, it looks like what it is not. For a book of apologetic—scholarly, temperate, sympathetic, loyal, as this is—stands first of all our mental necessities now, and deserves our most sincere gratitude. Mr. Micklem reminds us constantly of Professor Cairns. And that is not faint praise. Yet there is no slightest suspicion of unoriginality. He, too, finds the Universe explicable on the Christian theory and not otherwise; and he, too, finds it so out of his own experience.

The Rev. W. A. C. Allen has already learned much, but he has yet to learn the use of the paragraph. His paragraphs are chapters. One of them, near the beginning of the book, runs on till it has covered almost eight pages.

The book itself is good. It is a study in the personality of the *Old Testament Prophets* (Cambridge: Heffer; 6s. net). Mr. Allen secures our confidence by his introduction, in which he tells us how first the prophet then the priest gain their place and power. 'Experiences are common to all; the wish to interpret these experiences is likewise common; but the power to find a satisfactory interpretation is rare. Therefore when there appears a man who possesses a deeper feeling, a keener insight, a clearer power of expression than his fellows, such a man is able to supply the explanation after which others have felt themselves to be groping. Those who listen to his words feel that their darkness is being removed: he is hailed as a seer, a man of genius, a prophet: his teaching becomes authoritative. When once the teaching of such a man has become widely accepted amongst any people, the religion of that people is given a stamp which it will never lose altogether.'

The chapters on Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel are able and arresting. Jeremiah has captured the

heart of this expositor as of so many expositors before him.

The Nazareth Programme for the Life Worth Living (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net) is a strong title for a strong book. The anonymous author of the book, who calls himself Marcus Warrener, takes a practical spiritual attitude to Christ and the religion of Christ. And he can make his appeal to the modern mind by all the arts of rhetoric and printing. Why he chooses the special form of letters to imaginary correspondents (in this case a son and a daughter) is a puzzle, for it is the most unattractive form in which literature ever has been or could be presented. His ability is seen in overcoming its defects and our prejudice against it.

What does he write about? Many things. One chapter on Good News is thus divided—That God is—that Faith accepts the News—that Hope lives by the Good News—that God rules—that you are to despair of no man, not even of yourself.

Under the title of *Animism*, Mr. George William Gilmore has published a book in which he describes (fully enough for all but the special student of folklore, and authoritatively enough for everybody) the beliefs of primitive peoples about the soul of man (Boston: Marshall Jones Company; $1.75 net). And the beliefs of primitive peoples about the soul cover nearly all the religious beliefs they have, so that the book is in deed and in truth an introduction to the comparative study of Religion.

One of the shortest and most enjoyable chapters is that on the 'Descensus Averni.' It inevitably makes us think of that somewhat tottering clause in the Creed, 'He descended into Hell.' But whatever your attitude to that clause may be you cannot now say that its insertion was due to non-Christian influences. That has been said by Günkel, and Pfleiderer, and Bousset, and even Percy Gardner. But it is finally disproved by Loofs in his article in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Mr. Gilmore tells us briefly and clearly what the non-Christian beliefs were, but he does not even hint that they influenced those early Christian theologians who inserted the Descensus into the Creed.

'*A Last Diary of the Great Warr*, by Sam[l] Pepys, *Jun[r]*, sometime of Magdalene College, in Cambridge, and of His Majesty's Navy Office, Esquire, M.A.' (Lane; 6s. net). Such is the title page. It has to be quoted in full. For the modern Pepys is an historian, as accurately describing the political and social life of his time as the ancient Pepys did, and he deserves all the consideration due to his great office. Of course it is fooling, and excellent fooling too. Listen to this delightful mixture of big and little—all equally important to the great Sam[l], *jun[r]*:

'My new boots come home, I walk to try them so far as Hide Park Corner; with great satisfaction, finding them easy, and the cloth uppers spruce, but quiet. The news out of France all in the highest degree of fierce battles by north and south. Of which the best is Villers-Bretonneux most valiantly and cleverly reconquered by Australians and English soldiers, with 700 prisoners made. So the enemy gotten no nearer to Amiens, allbeit, towards the hills by Ypres, do press us hardly, and by the last account of it gets upon the hill of Kemmel. My boots shifted, I to the club, where our committee sitting upon our accompts: the 3[rd] time of our adjourning the matter these 6 weeks, and all my endeavour is to have them lessen our debt owed to the banque; but, to my infinite mortification, naught done but to talk of it. So this day I move the charges of jam rolly-poley to be 8*d.* in lieu of 6*d.*, and night-lights put in the smoaking room, with spills of paper to them in lieu of matches, as in other clubs. Which resolved, to my great content.'

A volume of devotional articles by the Rev. H. H. Montgomery, D.D., D.C.L., which were first of all published in the S.P.G. *Mission Field*, has been published by Messrs. Longmans under the title of *Musings on Faith and Practice* (3s. 6d. net). The 'musings' rest always on a text of Scripture, but they are not sermons. The sincerity of thought is accompanied by considerable expressiveness of language.

The study of biology is not so popular at present with the preacher as is the study of psychology, but it is quite as interesting and probably quite as useful. An authoritative contribution is a volume of *Lectures on Sex and Heredity*, delivered in Glasgow, 1917–18, by Dr. F. O. Bower, Dr. J. Graham Kerr, and Dr. W. E. Agar (Macmillan; 5s. net).

A valuable little book on the great Versions of the Bible has been written by the Rev. A. H. Finn and published by Messrs. Marshall Brothers under the title of *The Starting Place of Truth* (2s. 6d. net). It contains all that the reader of the Bible need wish to know about its early versions, and all that it contains is scholarly and reliable.

Things that Count (Marshall Brothers; 5s. net) is a volume of addresses and papers by the late Robinson Souttar, D.C.L., at one time M.P. for Dumfriesshire. Every address and every paper is intensely evangelical, the passionate pleading of an ambassador for Christ: 'Be ye reconciled to God.' And if for a moment the wicked thought has entered your heart that in that case you know all about it and there is nothing in it, dismiss the thought at once. The book is full of life; it is literature. Breadth and length and depth and height belong to it—all the dimensions of the richly furnished City of God. It is literature and it is art, but the art is not once in it for its own sake.

Portions of two poems are quoted. Where do they come from? One is—

> Who knocks so low?—'A little lonely sin.'—
> 'Slip through' we answer, and all Hell is in.

The other is—

> Ah, brother, draw not near
> Unto that mouth of fear,
> Lest a light tongue run out and lick thee up:
> But if, at God's command,
> They bind thee foot and hand,
> And fling thee where its serpents hiss and twine,
> Thou shalt go safe and free;
> Yea, Heaven shall walk with thee,
> And recreate thee in the fount divine.

A short memoir of the life of the Rev. Evan H. Hopkins, so long associated with the Keswick Convention, and editor of *The Life of Faith*, has been published by Messrs. Morgan & Scott under the title of *A Standard Bearer of Faith and Holiness* (1s. 3d. net). It contains Reminiscences by Dr. Eugene Stock, the Rev. W. Y. Fullerton, Dr. Smellie, and the Rev. J. J. Luce.

Mr. Walter Scott agrees with the Bishop of Durham that the Second Coming of our Lord is at hand. He writes *Prophetic Scenes and Coming Glories* (Morgan & Scott; 2s 6d. net) both to prove it and to prepare for it.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have published a volume of Lent addresses under the title of *Failure and Recovery* (2s. 6d. net). They are far above the reach of the average Lenten preacher; they have thought in them, apt illustration, and originality of Scripture interpretation. Their author is the Rev. Harrington C. Lees, M.A.

It is a study of Apostolic character. One of the Apostles has no recorded failure in his life. Who is he? Andrew. And why? Because he brought every difficulty to Jesus. 'I have read of a certain factory with complicated machinery for textile goods, where the instructions that are given in the workrooms are, "If your threads get tangled send for the foreman." One of the workers, a diligent and busy woman, got her threads tangled, and she tried to disentangle them, but only made them worse. After that she sent for the foreman. He came and looked, and then turned to her and said, "You have been doing this yourself." She said, "Yes." "Why did you not send for me, according to instructions?" he asked. And she, rather sullenly, said, "I did my best." And with that tact which a real leader should possess, he said quietly, "Remember that *doing your best is sending for me.*"'

Dr. Robert William Mackenna, the author of *The Adventure of Death* and *The Adventure of Life* has now written a book to which he gives the title of *Through a Tent Door* (Murray; 8s. net). He writes easily. He writes well. There are no slips in grammar. There is no massacre of those innocents the sentence and the paragraph. And he has something to write about.

It is the war. But it is the war as he himself saw it, as he saw it through a tent door. The first chapter, on the Door, is delightful. 'Once on an autumn night I saw a spectacle of unutterable beauty and bewildering surprise. All day long the air had been still and oppressive, so that men could hardly breathe. But, as the sun went down, the far horizon was lit by a flickering light, which flashed and disappeared, and danced and disappeared, and trembled and disappeared, and came and went again. And now and then the light endured for a longer period, when it seemed as though a window had been opened in heaven

that the eye of God might look upon the world. But when night came, with her flock of stars, the strange phenomenon changed. The elusive lilac light still trembled through the sky, but, nearer at hand among the pine-trees where our tents are pitched, little flashes of lambent flame seemed to rise from the ground and leap impetuously into a larger galaxy of light let down from the heavens to meet them. I know that it was all nothing more than an electrical storm, in whose vortex we chanced to be caught; but those eager flashes from the earth gathered into the white arms of light that bent to meet them from the skies, turned our thoughts from the material to the spiritual, and from scientific fact to sublime aspiration. "Behold, I show you a mystery: we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed."'

Later there is a description of a trench raid. It is almost as vivid; it is perhaps more engrossing. But the book will be read.

A special and prolonged study of the diseases of Palestine has been made by E. W. G. Masterman, M.D., F.R.C.S., D.P.H. Dr. Masterman has now published a book on the subject through the Palestine Exploration Fund. Its title is *Hygiene and Disease in Palestine in Modern and in Biblical Times* (2s. 6d. net). It is the work of an accurate scientific medical practitioner as well as acute observer. And, numerous as are the passages of Scripture it throws light upon, not one of them is touched without real illumination. Here is a modern matter: 'The question may well be asked at the present time how far has Palestine a climate suitable for Europeans wishing to make permanent homes there? At present malaria and other diseases are recurring scourges which greatly increase the danger and discomfort of those who would live there. But supposing these can be in places banished and in others mitigated, what is likely to be the effect on the European and his family who make the land their home? My impression is that in the higher mountain regions many Europeans may with care live comfortably, if they learn to restrain their energies, especially in the hot months, and their children can, with special precautions, be reared in health.'

What is not known about the training of little children to Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson, Sc.D., is not yet discovered. Her new book, *Bridget's Fairies* (R.T.S.; 4s. 6d. net), is all that the most imaginative child could desire to revel in, but it is a strictly scientific book. Its aim is education—education through the joy that the imagination brings. The illustrations in colour printing by Charles Robinson are appropriate.

The Rev. Stuart Robertson, M.A., is a preacher to children unsurpassed and perhaps unequalled. He does actually preach to the children. He strikes the right note every time, and he strikes it at once. Thus: the text is 'My son, give me thine heart' (Pr 23^{26}), and the title 'The Keeper of the Keys.'

'In a book the other day I read part of a letter a son had sent from the Front to his father. It said: "I am sending you all my keys except the latch-key. That I will keep, so that some day when I get leave I may walk in unexpectedly and give you a surprise." I don't know what the rest of the letter was like, but I am sure this bit was the heart of the letter for the father and mother. When they read it they would feel, "This is a right son. He has no secrets from us, nothing to hide, no Blue-Beard chamber that must not be entered, no forgotten corner where old shameful things lie. He knows himself and he trusts us. He gives us the run of all his affairs. He sends us all his keys. He knows us too. He knows he will always be welcome; that he can always walk in without waiting; that he has full right of entry into his father's house. Our house is open to him, and his heart is open to us."'

The new volume, written as it were in the trenches, is called *The Red Flowers* (R.T.S.; 1s. 6d. net).

'The object of this book,' says Mr. E. S. P. Haynes—it is his new book, *The Case for Liberty* (Grant Richards; 6s. net)—will be to show, 'both as regards political and social liberty, that liberty is the essential condition of all progress and improvement, just because it encourages, or at any rate makes possible, all kinds of political or social experiments. In any state or society where liberty exists the bad experiments will fail automatically, whereas in any other society they have a tendency to flourish artificially.'

And assuredly Mr. Haynes is not afraid of experiments. He says: 'How far the Free State necessarily reposes on a foundation of general

labour conscription is perhaps uncertain; but there can be no doubt whatever that it will soon be necessary for every citizen to have some knowledge of motor-driving, plumbing, and elementary chemistry, to say nothing of domestic service, if his or her life is to be at all tolerable.'

But is he not in a hurry? Is he not living in an atmosphere of panic? Scripture says, 'He that believeth shall not make haste.' Mr. Haynes does make haste; is it because he does not believe? 'The decline of the Christian religion,' he says, 'necessarily involving in due course the decline of Christian morality, has inevitably affected the fundamental motives of conduct. Goldwin Smith wrote in one of his essays fifty years ago that when the world at large really ceased to believe in the Christian religion the world would have a very bad quarter of an hour, and his prophecy has at last come true.'

Messrs. Rivingtons have added to their 'New Testament for Schools' a Commentary on *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, by the Rev. A. R. Whitham, M.A. (3s.). The notes are characterized by reserve. If there is no certainty as to the interpretation of a passage, Mr. Whitham is not the man to say there is. Commenting on 'I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven' (10[18]) he says: 'Our Lord's saying is mysterious; but it seems to refer to the overthrow of evil which was the result of the Incarnation (cp. Rev xii.) and the Passion. Our Lord prophetically speaks of it as already accomplished, as if with the rapidity of a thunder-bolt. The Christian Fathers think that He was also indirectly warning the Seventy against *pride* in their spiritual powers.'

Mr. Robert Scott has published a small volume of short sermons by the Rev. H. Hunter Parker, M.A., Vicar of Arlecdon, on *The Providence of God* and other kindred topics (2s. net). They are short and they are simple, but they are real.

Christ and the Woman's Movement, although it is the title of the Rev. C. Broughton-Thompson's book (Scott; 2s. net), is the subject of only one of the articles in it. The other articles are on the Old Testament, Christ, the Social System, Education, and International Relations. All is in order, however. And if not much freshness, much good sense is to be found in the discussions.

How does the unbeliever in inspiration account for the Prophets? We seem to find an answer in a book on *Mind and Conduct* (Scribners; $1.75 net) written by Henry Rutgers Marshall, L.H.D., D.S., and delivered first of all at the Union Theological Seminary in New York as the Morse Lectures. It is the work of a man of distinguished ability and evident earnestness, a secularist frankly enough, but not at all aggressively. It contains one of the acutest criticisms yet made of that popular scheme of philosophy called utilitarianism.

Well, Dr. Marshall has reason to touch on the Prophet. He has laid down (in italics) the proposition that '*Moral conduct is an adventure in relation to the future.* It is related to adaptation to conditions that appear to be new, and is thus bound up with processes of reasoning which are the psychic correspondents of adaptation.'

'Now reasoning is creative. It takes data given in present experience, inclusive of retrospective elements telling of the past, and undertakes to mould them to effect a better adaptation in the future. The motives to this action of future significance vary as the present and retrospective elements of experience vary. In relatively few cases do we find ourselves consciously concerned with pleasure resultants. We are concerned with the adventure as such. This adventure in most cases results in failure. History is filled with the records of false prophets who have led forlorn hopes. The conduct they have suggested has turned out to be inefficient and to involve unhappiness. In some cases the adventure results in success. Then we have in the future an increase of efficiency and of happiness. Then the prophet has honor in future generations.'

Jesus said of the Old Testament Scriptures, *They Testify of Me*, and Georgiana M. Forde has taken the words for the title of a book in which she goes through the Psalms one by one and shows how easily and how immediately they testify of Him (Skeffingtons; 3s. 6d. net). The direct application is occasionally lit up by an anecdote or other illustration.

The Rev. S. M. Statham, M.A., LL.D., Rector of Cottesford and Hardwick-with-Tusmore, Oxon. has published a volume of Notes for Sermons—*Sermons in Brief* he calls it (Skeffingtons; 6s. net). His method is to arrange the ideas that he finds

in his text and write them down as a sermon that might be read. But he does not read it. Instead, he takes out of it a 'word outline'—that is to say, its chief points expressed in a word or phrase—and preaches without reading. He publishes both the sermon and the outline. He has a strong belief in the value of discussing the *words* of the text. The text for Trinity Sunday is Eph 4^{14}, 'Tossed to and fro.' He discusses 'tossed' in this way:

'The first notion that occurs to one by the word "tossed" is that of a violent upturning and jerking by an enraged bull, or the lightly throwing to and fro of a ball or shuttlecock, but the Greek word from which it is translated means to roll in billows; and St. Paul seems to exhort Christians neither to be childish nor to let the mind, heart, actions be "everything by turns and nothing long," or like the rolling billows to be influenced by every wind, expending their force on sandy foundations, leaving naught behind but froth, cold, damp, and wet impressions. A sorry estate when applied to man's faith, service, and love. Tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine.'

Some one has said sweepingly that you cannot describe anything by negatives. But the writer of the Apocalypse has done it. He has described the New Jerusalem to some extent positively. There are gates of pearl and streets of gold; there is a river and fruit trees bordering it. But much more does he describe it negatively—by the absence of the things which belong to the old Jerusalems. There shall be no sin, he says, no sorrow or sighing, no death. More than that, there shall be no sun and no moon, and 'I saw no temple therein.' But then, one positive makes up for all these negatives—Christ is there.

How know I that it looms lovely that land I have never seen,
With morning glories and heartsease and unexampled green,
With neither heat nor cold in the balm redolent air?
Not all of this I know; but this is so:
Christ is there!

In his volume of sermons on *The Vision of Christ* Canon A. R. Ryder, D.D. (Skeffingtons; 6s. net), preaches about the New Jerusalem and emphasizes one negative especially: 'I saw no temple therein.' They did well, he says, who built fine temples on earth, and they do well who beautify them, but 'all our salvation depends upon the Lamb that was slain.' Canon Ryder believes in the virtue of good poetry well quoted in the pulpit. And he believes that good poetry can be quoted again though it is already quite familiar.

In his volume of sermons entitled *Righteousness and Peace* (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net) the Rev. G. Cecil White, M.A., has a fine appropriate text for Harvest. It is He 6^{1}, 'Let us go on unto perfection.' We see the pointedness at once when he says: 'In that season the corn and the fruits reach their perfection. The bud has opened into flower, and the flower has reached its perfection in fruit.'

Then he says: 'So, side by side with the scenes we have been witnessing in field and garden, of flower and fruit reaching their perfection, I set the picture of the spiritual harvest—the picture of souls growing in grace till they reach their Perfection—the likeness of the One Perfect Man, "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."'

This one thought runs through the sermon (one thought runs through each of the others also), well expressed and worth expressing well.

The Editor of the S.P.C.K. series of 'Translations of Early Documents' has been clever enough to secure a translation of the Papyri found at Elephantine from Mr. A. Cowley. No man is better fitted, for no man had more to do with the discovery and decipherment of them. The volume is entitled *Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra* (4s. 6d. net).

A thorough investigation into the history of *The Eucharistic Office of the Book of Common Prayer* has been made by the Rev. Lewis Wright, M.A., B.D. (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). And the exposition is as readable as the investigation is thorough. It is just such a student's handbook as makes dispensable all other books on the subject.

Spiritism in the Light of the Faith (S.P.C.K.; 3s. net) is the title of a volume on the difference between spiritualism and Christianity which has been written by the Rev. T. J. Hardy, M.A. Mr. Hardy makes his books difficult for the reader

by the extremity of his ritualism. But he is at least fair to the spiritualist, while he shows how needless to a believer in Christ the whole spiritualistic position is and how hurtful.

Professor Alexander Souter, D.Litt., has translated for the S.P.C.K. series of Latin Texts, two of Tertullian's *Treatises*, the one Concerning Prayer and the other Concerning Baptism (3s. net). The text he has used is that of the Vienna 'Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum.' He has made his translation and written his notes independently of all other editions. The Introduction is short, full of matter, and most accurate.

Number nine of the S.P.C.K. 'Texts for Students' is *The Inscription on the Stele of Méša' commonly called The Moabite Stone* (6d. net). The little book contains the text of the Stone, both in Moabite and in Hebrew, with a new translation. The author is the Rev. H. F. B. Compston, M.A.

The S.P.C.K. 'Helps for Students of History' are increasing. This month we have to notice the issue of five volumes—*An Introduction to the Study of Colonial History*, by A. P. Newton, M.A., D.Litt., B.Sc. (6d. net); *Parish History and Records*, by A. Hamilton Thompson, M.A., F.S.A. (8d. net); *Hints on the Study of English Economic History*, by W. Cunningham, D.D., F.B.A. (8d. net); *The French Renaissance*, by Arthur Tilley, M.A. (8d. net); and *The French Wars of Religion*, by the same author (6d. net).

It is not hesitation in assigning universality and finality to the Christian religion that makes so many of us desirous to know all that can be known about other religions; nor is the desire due solely to the scientific and searching temper of our age. We now believe that God left not Himself without witness even in Arabia when Muhammad gathered the wild and warlike tribes round him and gave them the Qur'an for their instruction. And our desire is to discover the truth which the Qur'an contains that we may know God better and that we may be the better instruments of His hand to add to the Qur'an the knowledge of the grace of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

The Teaching of the Qur'an is the title of a work written by the Rev. H. Weitbrecht Stanton, Ph.D., D.D., and published by the Central Board of Missions and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (7s. net). It satisfies our desire to the uttermost. A trained scholar and an intimate student of both the life and the literature of Islam, Dr. Stanton is also a highly accomplished writer. He has spared no pains to make this book perfect and complete, wanting nothing. There is a history of the growth of the Qur'an; its teaching is classified and expounded; and there is a most useful Subject Index, based perhaps upon Hughes's Dictionary of Islam, but to tell the truth much more accurate than that useful book. We congratulate the author on a difficult work well done.

Mr. Norman E. Dando is another preacher to children. He preaches through the 'Banbury Advertiser' first, and then through a book called *Cleaning the Boots* (Stockwell; 2s. net). He forgets the parents and gives himself wholly to boys and girls from ten to fourteen. He is neither moral nor spiritual; he is simply natural.

Christ and God.[1]

By the Reverend Hugh Ross Mackintosh, M.A., D.Phil., D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, New College, Edinburgh.

'God,' writes Tyndal, the martyr translator of our English New Testament, 'is not man's imagination, but that only which He saith of Himself.' If we let our minds wander about just at random, picking up our ideas anywhere, our thoughts of God are as likely to be wrong as right. The Jews had a genius for religion, and yet you find Jesus telling them repeatedly that their conceptions of God were erroneous and certain to lead to mischief. So we, if we gather our impressions of God indiscriminately from a variety of quarters—surface studies of history, queer books, the newspapers, talks with people in a railway carriage—are likely

[1] At more than one point in the following pages there are echoes of Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin's fine volume, *Some Christian Convictions*.

enough to end up with a picture that gravely misrepresents Him. He is so great, anyhow, that the antecedent probability is we never could discover the truth unless He took the initiative and told us. And the Christian religion is the religion which teaches that God *did* take the initiative in a certain way, in order to be sure we knew Him properly; and that this way is Jesus Christ.

Christ and God—that is our subject now. Look a single moment at these three words—Christ and God. Isn't it rather suggestive that we can put these two names close up to each other, utter them in one breath, without the slightest sense of incongruity? I have never seen an address called 'St. Paul and God,' or 'Abraham Lincoln and God,' or 'Mr. Gladstone and God,' or 'Florence Nightingale and God.' And certainly, had these people seen their own names in that collocation, I expect they would have been horrified. They would have said, 'Don't be irreverent.' But about 'Christ and God' we cannot feel like that. Instinctively we are aware that the two names go well together, and that the people who have done most for the world's well-being have thought so too. And stranger still, we have an inkling that Jesus would have agreed with them. He did not think it at all unfitting that He should put Himself into one sentence alongside of the Father. That either revolts one or it arrests one profoundly.

When we turn over the pages of the Evangelists —and we must go by them, if we are not to talk mere whimsies—one thing leaps to the eye. It is this: Jesus never doubted that He knew God. It was knowledge by acquaintance. There were no abstract arguments; He never forced men to their knees by sheer reasoning; what He did was to put out His hand and lift a veil. No question that He had a special familiarity with God ever entered His mind. Whether speaking the parables or healing the sick or defending the oppressed or forgiving sin, always He obviously felt that He was acting for God, that God was acting *in* Him. The sense never left Him of a peculiar touch with God which He had no desire to keep to Himself, but which He longed to communicate to men, because He knew it would make all the difference to their hopes and fears. The consciousness of God was like a garment of light in which He walked.

Jesus was quite sure of His insight into God, and His perpetual fellowship with Him; perhaps it is still more wonderful that those who knew Christ best, the disciples, had no doubt of it either. It is no unheard-of thing for a man to credit himself with powers which all his friends scout the very thought of: but Jesus' friends, the people who had watched Him, had an unclouded certainty about His nearness to the Most High. That was what *made* Jesus, for them. We can't think of Marshal Foch without instantly thinking of the War; and it was literally impossible for an Evangelist to remember Jesus and leave out His connexion with God—that suffusing and encompassing Presence that put Him in a class by Himself. The disciples had a tremendously high conception of God, particularly after Jesus was done with them; and yet they saw Jesus and God together. As the two stereoscopic pictures, right and left, merge into one solid object—so, when they looked back, they saw Christ and the Father as one. It is an extraordinary certificate to Jesus. It leaves you wondering whether there was really any limit to Him. They felt He was completely like the Father He had worshipped, and they put Him beside God in their imagination and their prayers. That was His right place; it was there He belonged.

There, then, is our great point—God is wrapped up in Christ: the two resemble each other so much they really can't be separated. Now that Christ has been here, it is genuinely impracticable for us to detach the view of God that goes with us into working, loving and praying from Jesus of Nazareth. And when our mind travels back to the ages before Christ came, we have to conceive of God as preparing for this, as being unable to refrain from disclosing Himself in Jesus.

Some one says: 'How am I to be sure that God is exactly like Jesus? I have heard people say He isn't in the least; and you surely aren't going to say it is self-evident that the God indicated by the present condition of Europe has a Christlike character?' That is an enormous difficulty; if we get over it, it can only be with a struggle and real prayer.

But the practical point I want to make is this. You feel it questionable whether the Unseen Power behind the world is genuinely like Jesus—have you taken pains to know Jesus closely? I don't mean have you read books about Him, or listened to addresses; but have you put your mind steadily to the Gospel narratives? I have known a man

spend three months in a laboratory identifying a bacillus; have you lived with Matthew, Mark and Luke in order to get to know, away beyond all doubt, what manner of person He actually was?

Suppose you have. You have dwelt in Christ's company as He spoke of repentance, and laid His hand on the sick, and said to the paralytic man, 'Courage, brother, your sins are pardoned,' and appealed to Zaccheus' hospitality and changed him by friendship, and had the hem of His garment touched in the crowd by the woman, and confronted wrong alone, and set His face to go to Jerusalem, and drank the lonely cup of agony in Gethsemane—you have listened, and watched, and reflected. You have felt—this is quite possible, quite reasonable—that you know Jesus better than you do any of your contemporaries. Well, now, what are you going to do with that Figure? Where are you going to place Him? He is Highest in the Highest realm you know, and you cannot conceive anything more high—no more perfect combination of Love, and Righteousness and Forceful Purpose, you feel, can be imagined. Either there is no God, or the God there is, is morally inferior to Jesus, or He is just precisely what Jesus is. If I had never heard of God before, should I not be excused if I cried out, This is the God for me? He shames me by His reality; He exalts me by His love; He passes into me and through me His own will to redeem; He clarifies and realizes for me my highest inspirations from the unseen. I stand before Him, and, do what I will, I cannot but have awakened in me a religious response. In other words, only let us get close up to Jesus, so as really to make Him out, and we find we have no other use for the word 'God' but to apply it to Him. *That* is God, or we may put the word away. Had we not seen Jesus, we might have been satisfied with less; but by His character He has spoiled us for any poorer or lower idea of the Divine.

That is what the word Revelation means. The Revealer is he who opens a new world for you, of Truth, Goodness, Beauty. And always after he has shown it, you say to yourself, Yes, I know, it was bound to be like that. So Christ lives before you—teaching, healing, helping, forgiving—and you wake up, after looking at Him for a while, to discover you have a new impression of God. And you say to yourself, gratefully, adoringly, Yes, I know, it was bound to be like that. God, if I have a God, could not be anything but a copy of Jesus Christ.

Just here let us guard ourselves against a misapprehension which is sometimes created by our habit of speaking about Jesus as the picture or portrait of God. When I stand before a great portrait, it may be stately and beautiful, but one fact I observe—it doesn't *move*. It does not act or get things done. It is still life. But when I look at Jesus in the Gospels, wondering what He reveals about God, I see that He is moving—He is going somewhere. He does not drift through life, He makes unswervingly for a goal that puts its stamp on every detail of His career and bars out many things that might otherwise have been permissible. He is absolutely absorbed in getting the Kingdom of God established in the world of mankind—the new, better, gladder order of things in which God's glorious will is realized. And I further can make this out, as I keep on looking, that He regards no price as too high if only He can have that purpose accomplished. Not even the price of death, in shame and pain and darkness. Whatever the reason, Jesus ended at Calvary, and He went to Calvary of His own accord.

You can't leave the implications of that out of the new conception of God you are allowing Jesus to teach you. It proclaims two things about the Father. To begin with, He has a purpose for this planet of ours and for the human family gathered on its surface. The world is a ship, not an iceberg, and there is a great hand upon the rudder. God is pursuing a vast world-embracing plan that spells Love and Righteousness just as much as Christ was pursuing a plan when He taught and cured and prayed and gathered disciples and refused a crown in Palestine two thousand years ago. Many things have been said about Jesus; but I have never heard of its being said that He lived at random. Follow Him from Nazareth to Jerusalem, and then to Cæsarea Philippi, and eventually to Golgotha, and at every step you can tell 'that something deep is on.' He has a plan, and the plan is not for His own advantage, and He is convinced that the happiness and value of every human life is bound up with its coming into line with His great object. God is like that. He means something with history; He is bent on bringing us to some point of building some vast enduring beautiful social structure out of the lives into which He enters.

The other truth is that, if we may use the expression, God will stick at nothing in the way of sacrifice to get His plan executed. Jesus did not go back when death confronted Him; He paid the price and counted the object well worth its cost. We can carry that over to God just as it stands. Henry Sloane Coffin has said that 'at Calvary we see the rocky coast-line of men's thoughts and feelings against which the incoming tide of God's mind and heart broke; and we can hear the moaning of the resisted waves'; then he adds that 'the incoming waters break into the silver spray of speech, and their one word is Love.' If His Kingdom can be set up in no other way, then God is ready for the cost. Life is teaching us all the time that the best things cost most, and God Himself bows to that law.

Don't you think Christendom is in danger, just at the moment, of settling its conceptions of God with the Cross kept well out of sight? We so readily avert our eyes from tragedy. We prefer to grasp at something that is cheap and easy. Anything sombre or morally profound and silencing daunts and mystifies us. I believe the Church in many quarters is called upon to guard itself supremely against a happy-go-lucky notion of the Divine Fatherhood; against playing with the thought of a Fatherhood that means nothing more than smiling benevolence, and, in a phrase of the New Testament, 'winks' at evil. Well, a Fatherhood that insults the startled and agonizing conscience because it is regarded as treating things like cruelty and selfishness and uncleanness lightheartedly and wiping them out with good-humoured tolerance will not carry us far. If you want a Fatherhood of God that will stay with you, and support you in view of life's worst realities instead of drugging you with moral levity, take your thought of it out of Jesus' experience, and therefore put at its very heart the Cross. Build your view of God round the tremendous fact that He judged a Divine death for the sinful necessary to their redemption, and that, since the sacrifice had to be, He willingly stooped to make it. Calvary is a window opening into God's heart. There we see into the life of the Lord of heaven and earth. 'Behind the cross of wood outside the gate of Jerusalem we catch sight of a vast, age-enduring cross in the heart of the Eternal, forced on Him generation after generation by His children's unlikeness to their Father.' *That* sense of God's Fatherliness goes down to the depths of our being and thrills the conscience with ennobling satisfaction. It fortifies the soul to know that in our desperate struggle with evil we have on our side One who took the conflict so seriously that He grappled with sin in pain, and put it away by the sacrifice of Himself.

If, then, we take our cue from Jesus Christ we must think of God as Redemptive Love, not shallow or good-natured, but passionately righteous and utterly self-denying. But does this Love have power over the world? It ought to be sovereign; our hearts tell us it should be uppermost, but then is it so? Is there any experience of Jesus that illustrates the sovereign power of God—exhibits Him to us as sufficiently in control over all things to accomplish through them His will? That is where the Resurrection breaks in with its vindication of God as mighty to save. He was mighty to save Jesus from death's grasp, therefore we know He is wise and strong enough not to let nature or men defeat His purpose. All along during Jesus' life, God was 'the loving Response from the unseen which answered the trust of Jesus'; and that loving Response went on after Jesus had bowed His head and died. Like the Psalmist long before, Jesus had trusted the Father so utterly as to say, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in the grave, Thou wilt not suffer Thine holy one to see corruption'; and the Father did not play Him false. In the plenitude of His loving Power He kept His word to Jesus His Son, and lifted Him above the strangle-hold of death. There is nothing that can hope to prevail when matched with the Father's redemptorial energies acting through a perfectly consecrated will. That is the kind of God men believe in through Jesus Christ.

Now if what Christ discloses about God is true, it is mightily important for our life, and for our views and convictions about the world and religion and society and everything. For example, clearly if Jesus was right, if He represented God correctly, then *you* can have communion with God. Jesus had it, and He offered it to others through Him as intermediary. He brings God to us, in the sense that He lives God before our eyes; He brings us to God, in the sense that just by being Himself He evokes our trust for the Father whose love is shining through His life, and persuades us to put away suspicion and incredulity and pride. An intermediary is a person who brings people together, and Jesus does that for God and us.

Supposing He has done that, supposing you have allowed Him to do it and are now infinitely in debt to Him for having done it, what will it mean for us to know God as our Father? Not merely that we accept the idea of His kinship with our nature and rely on His kindly disposition; but that we let Him establish a direct line of authorship with our life and father our impulses, our thoughts, our ideals, our intentions. Jesus kept accepting His life and its meaning at intervals from God. As has been said: 'His every wish and motive had its heredity in the Father whom He trusted with loyal childlike confidence, and served with a grown son's intelligent and willing comradeship.' It is up to us to let Jesus infect us with that spirit.

Again, if God is similar to Jesus, and we see Him through Jesus' eyes, we shall be quite sure that there is just one God, and that He rules everything there is. Polytheists have a host of gods—one for the forest, one for the wind, one ruling the sea and another the sky and so on. We imitate them, do we not? by having one thought of God for home life and religious fellowship, and another for business and politics and international affairs. All that division must go; if Jesus is trustworthy at all, what we see in Him is the only possible God. His will is the principle that must be put down at the foundation of family life, prosperous industry, decent statesmanlike foreign relations, righteous social arrangements. To put it in a single word, He is not our God only, He is the God of other people. When we treat our neighbours shamefully, or acquiesce in their being treated shamefully because they are so weak they cannot call society to account, then it is He we have to deal with really. That is how things are, according to Jesus. If He is right about the centre, He must be right about the circumference. If we see what He saw, we must see a Father with a passionate interest in all others—men and women and children, light-skinned and dark-skinned races, Britons and Germans—and when we think of other people, and adjust our life to theirs, we have to remember that, or there will be trouble.

Long since men believed that, were the great Nile tracked to its source, its origin might be found in some tiny spring, some scanty nameless rivulet. But when explorers finally pierced the secret, it was to discover that the river sprang from a vast inland sea, sweeping with horizon unbroken round the whole compass of the sky. So we are prone to fear lest the river of salvation, that flows past our doors and into which we have dipped our vessels, might, if followed back to its fountain-head, prove to be fed only from a grudging and uncertain store. But in truth the Father's mercy is like the rolling sea at the continent's heart—that sea from which the great river bursts, full and brimming at its birth. It is from everlasting to everlasting. Shall we not rise up to take it for our own? Shall we not live in the joy of it, and freely take its power for holiness, for power, for brotherhood? 'I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor things present nor things to come, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

II.

'Who against hope believed in hope.'—Ro 4[18].

GLOOMY NOVEMBER!

'Tis late before the sun will rise,
And early he will go;
Grey fringes hang from the grey skies,
And wet the ground below.

The sun itself is ill bested
A heavenly sign to show;
His radiance, dimmed to glowing red,
Can hardly further go.[1]

These verses were written by a poet whose memory is very much beloved. One of the reasons why so many people love him is that even into his very saddest poems he brings a note of hope. They never end in the sad minor key.

[1] *The Poetical Works of George MacDonald*, i. 365, 366.

Listen to the last verse of this November song, and you will understand what I mean.

> But while sad thoughts together creep,
> Like bees too cold to sting,
> God's children, in their beds asleep,
> Are dreaming of the Spring.

You boys and girls think only of November's gloom. But I remember speaking to you about a boy who gathered potatoes in a field with his mother one November afternoon, and how, although he did not notice it, there was a plough going quite near. That meant that the farmer was preparing for the spring. He had no doubt of its coming.

I wonder how many of you have your birthdays in November, and if you have ever thought that it was a misfortune to have been born in this the dullest of all the months. To-day, I want to tell you about a boy who was a November baby, and who turned out to be one of the bright spirits of this earth. He was delicate during the whole of his somewhat short life; and when in 1894 he died at the age of forty-four, ever so many people all over the world mourned his loss, for they loved him. They had got to know him through the delightful books he wrote. The story of his life was read eagerly here, there, and everywhere. His letters, published in a volume by themselves, were read with even greater interest. They had been written to his friends when he was far away from his native Scotland. Now, you may occasionally hear summer visitors to Edinburgh, especially those who come from America and far away Australia, saying, 'Take us to see the house where Robert Louis Stevenson was born.'

The part of Robert Louis' life that most people like to read best is the beginning. There we are told about the time when he was a little boy. Poor little fellow, he was scarcely ever well. Croup, pneumonia, and feverish colds kept following each other all the time; in winter he seemed constantly to be coughing. But his father's favourite name was 'Smout'; he knew little Louis was plucky.

There were two people who had a great deal to do with making Robert Louis Stevenson the sort of boy he was—his mother and his nurse, Alison Cunningham, whom he always called, 'Cummy.' To the end of his life he loved Cummy. No wonder. She was the one who taught him to think of the Bible as the best book in the world. She read it very often, and talked to him about doing what was right, so that his young mind became full of religious thoughts. One day he came to his mother and said, 'Mamma, I have drawed a man; shall I draw his soul now?' Another day he said to her, 'You cannot be good unless you pray.' 'How do you know?' his mother asked. 'Because I have tried it,' was his answer. Cummy read the Bible in a very impressive manner. Her little charge kept making pictures in his mind as she went on. The pictures were all taken from places near his own home. The 'pastures green' of the twenty-third Psalm were stubble fields by Edinburgh's *Water of Leith*; 'Death's dark vale' was an archway in the nearest cemetery.

His cough gave 'Lou,' as Cummy used to call him, many sleepless nights; he sometimes prayed for sleep, or for morning to come—his poor little body felt all shaken. Cummy would lift him out of bed and carry him to the window, where she would show him one or two windows still lit up; and then they would tell each other that there might be other sick little boys waiting like them for the morning.

Doubtless Cummy helped to foster within him the hopeful spirit that buoyed him up through life. When he became a man and was writing his books —among them were some that boys and girls like to read—he had to fight a battle with ill-health all the time And by perseverance he trained himself to write well. 'He's an awfu' laddie for speirin' questions,' said an old man who knew him; 'whenever you turn your back, awa' he gangs and writes it a' doon.'

Through his long and trying struggle with ill-health Louis was more than merely hopeful. He had the mirth of a child. One friend described him as 'skipping upon the hills of life.' When at last he found he could not live in this country, or indeed anywhere in Europe, he settled in far away Samoa. He loved his home in Scotland, and was very sorry to leave it; but he made up his mind to be thankful and glad in the lonely Pacific island. No doubt his gaiety must occasionally have cost him an effort; but Cummy's lessons came back to him there. He used to say he felt sure that he believed everything was for the best because he believed in God. 'I saw the sea to be great,' were his words, 'and the earth in that little corner was all friendship to me. So wherever a man is, he will find something to please and pacify him. In the

town he will meet pleasant faces of men and women and see beautiful flowers at a window, or hear a cage bird singing at the corner of a street; and for the country—let him look for it in the right spirit and he will surely find it.'

And, boys and girls, listen to one of the prayers he wrote for use at family worship in Samoa:

'The day returns and brings us the petty round of irritating concerns and duties.

'Help us to play the man. Help us to perform them with laughter and kind faces. Let cheerfulness abound with industry.

'Give us to go blithely on our business all this day, bring us to our resting beds weary and content and undishonoured and grant us in the end the gift of sleep.'

When at last he lay dead in the hall of his house one of the Samoan chiefs came, and crouching beside the body said, 'I am only a poor Samoan, and ignorant, others are rich and can give Tusitala presents: I am poor, and can give nothing this last day he receives his friends. When Mataafa was taken, who was our support but Tusitala? We were in prison and he cared for us. We were sick and he made us well. We were hungry and he fed us. The way was no longer than his kindness. You are great people and full of love. Yet who among you is so great as Tusitala? What is your love to his love?'

He was buried, by his own request, away up on a hilltop, and the Samoan chiefs have forbidden the use of firearms on the hillside where he lies, that the birds may live there undisturbed and raise about his grave the songs he loved so well.

It is a good message that the story of Robert Louis Stevenson's life gives us—that we must meet whatever comes to us with thankfulness and hope. He had a sure foundation for his gladness. It was laid in Cummy's days. Many a time he would be fearful and doubt the goodness of God. But joy he felt to be a duty because Jesus said, 'Rejoice and be exceeding glad.'

Robert Louis Stevenson when a little boy said, 'You can't be good unless you pray.' Be like him; try it.

Slippery Places.

'Slippery places.'—Ps 73^{18}.

I expect you think they are about the jolliest places in the world, and I quite agree with you. What a high old time you can have when the frost comes and you go skimming down the long slides, or flying over the ice on your skates, or sailing down the hills on your toboggan! If you get a fall or a bump or two it only adds to the fun. You pick yourself up and are none the worse. Yes, that kind of slippery place is just splendid.

But the slippery places I am thinking of aren't a bit like that. They are covered with thick black mud, and if you fall down you come up all muddy and dirty—that is to say, if you don't sink altogether in the mire.

Now perhaps you are wondering where these places are, because, of course, you want to avoid them. Well, they are to be found in any place where we are in danger of doing wrong. When we are with bad companions, we are in a very slippery place. When we are doing something we would rather our mother did not see us do, we are in a slippery place. When we are tempted to tell a lie to shield ourselves from punishment, or crib our exercises to save ourselves trouble, we are in a slippery place. When we are very sure of ourselves, sure that nothing could tempt us to do wrong, that nothing could ever make us fall, however much other people might tumble down, then we are in a very slippery place indeed, and the slightest push from behind will send us sprawling in the mud.

1. Now the first thing I want to say about these slippery places is—never walk into them of your own accord.

There was a young fox once who was just setting out in life. He didn't know very much about it, but he had the sense to ask the advice of those older and wiser than himself. So he went to his father and asked him would he please tell him some trick by which he could get away from the hounds if they were chasing him. Father Fox was a wise old gentleman, and he bore several scars which showed that he had been through many a tough fight. But when his son asked him that question he shook his head. 'No, my dear boy,' said he, 'I can tell you of no such trick. In my experience, the best plan is to keep out of the hounds' way.'

And that is the safest way to deal with the slippery places—keep out of their way. Sometimes they are disguised. They look very safe and pleasant till we try to walk on them. But more often they are well advertised. There is a big danger board up with letters a foot long which the

eyes of conscience can read only too well; and if we come to grief on them it is our own fault.

A good old man tells us how, when he was a small boy, a minister came to his home and gave him a piece of wise advice which he never forgot. 'When in trouble,' he said, 'kneel down and ask God's help; but never climb over the fence into the devil's ground and then kneel down and ask help. Pray from God's side of the fence.' And that just means, don't run into temptation, don't walk on to the slippery places of your own accord.

2. But sometimes we find ourselves in a slippery place by no fault of our own. Sometimes we are suddenly met by a big temptation although we have tried to keep to the firm, straight path. And all of a sudden our feet feel shaky and we are terribly afraid we shall fall in the mud. What are we to do then? Well, there are just two things we can do.

First, we must plant our feet as firmly as we can and walk on steadily and carefully till we reach safer ground. God sometimes lets temptations come to us in order that, in conquering them, we may become stronger, and better, and braver.

And, second, we must remember that God is holding us up. If you look up the second last verse of the second last book in the Bible you will find a beautiful sentence that the minister often repeats at the end of the service. It begins, 'Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling,' or, as the Revised Version of the Bible puts it, 'Now unto him that is able to guard you from stumbling.' And I want you to remember these words every time you find yourself in a slippery place.

Have you seen your mother helping your little baby brother to walk? She puts her hands under his arms and holds him up so that he cannot fall. God is just like that. He puts His strong hands under our arms, and if we lean on Him we need never stumble, however slippery our path.

The Topaz.

'The topaz of Ethiopia shall not equal it.'—Job 28^{19}.

November is often a dull, gloomy month, but it brings us a cheerful, sunny stone—the topaz. The topaz got its name in a curious way. Topaz comes from a Greek word meaning 'to seek.' The stone was first found in a certain island in the Red Sea which was often surrounded by fog. And because the sailors had to seek long for the island ere they found it, they called the gem 'topaz.'

How many of you know a topaz? Well, as there are three different stones called 'topaz' you will be excused if you don't recognize one when you see it. The true topaz is a stone which comes to us chiefly from Brazil, and it is usually golden or yellow or honey-coloured. But it is found also without any colour at all, clear and limpid, and then it is so like the diamond that it is very difficult for ordinary people to tell the difference. These colourless topazes have been nicknamed 'slave's diamonds,' but there is a prettier name than that for them. The Brazilians call them *pingas d'agoa*, and the French *gouttes d'eau*, both of which mean 'drops of water.'

The second stone known as 'topaz' is our old friend the corundum, only it is yellow corundum, not red corundum like the ruby, or blue corundum like the sapphire. This yellow corundum is called the *Oriental* topaz.

The third stone known as 'topaz' is one we are all very familiar with, for it is neither more nor less than the stone which is set in kilt brooches and other Highland jewellery, the cairngorm or Scotch topaz. I expect a good many of the girls here will have a piece of jewellery set with a Scotch topaz, and if any of the boys have a plaid to their kilt they will be very proud of the cairngorm which fastens it on the shoulder.

Now, to return to the first, or real topaz. There are several remarkable things about it. To begin with, it is three and a half times heavier than water. Then if you heat it, or rub it, it becomes electric like amber. If you heat it slowly to a red heat (having first packed it in lime magnesia or asbestos) and cool it equally slowly, you will find that your yellow topaz has turned pink. That is how pink topazes are made, for the natural stone is never that shade. Then though the topaz is a hard stone which cuts and polishes beautifully, strange to say it is very brittle, and if you let it fall you may pick it up in two.

The topaz was supposed in olden times to bring its wearer beauty, wisdom, and long life. It was also believed to quench thirst. Perhaps that was because the colourless topazes are so like drops of pure water.

There is a story of a thirst-quenching Indian topaz whose owner was a Hindu magician or necromancer. One of the Indian Rajahs or

princes, who was fighting a neighbouring prince, asked the magician to help him to win a battle. The battle took place, but alas! the magician's help was vain, for the Rajah was beaten and the necromancer himself wounded to death. As he lay dying on the battle-field he heard near him the groans of a poor wounded soldier who was crying out for a drop of water to quench his burning thirst. With a last effort of strength the necromancer threw his precious jewel to the soldier, telling him to lay it on his heart. No sooner had the man done so than his thirst vanished and his wound healed.

Well, that is only a tale. But I have told it you because I think its meaning and that of the topaz are one—'Be sympathetic.' What is sympathy? The dictionary tells us that it is 'feeling with' others. There used to be an old conundrum (I expect it is still alive)—'Why is sympathy like blind man's buff?' 'Because it's a fellow feeling for a fellow creature.' Now I want to ask you, 'Why is sympathy like a topaz?' And I shall give you three reasons.

1. *It is cheering.*—The topaz is a cheerful stone. Did you ever notice that yellow is a cheerful colour? It is. It 'makes a sunshine in a shady place.' If you have a yellow paper on a dull north room, that room will look as if the sun were streaming into it. So sympathy warms and cheers.

2. *It is electric.*—It is something that goes out from you to some one else, or comes from some one else to you. You can't catch hold of it and say, 'This is sympathy'; but it is like a wave of electricity—you feel it. It makes you tingle with pleasure. It attracts you like a magnet.

3. *It is fragile.*—It is a delicate sort of thing. You can't bounce in on somebody and blurt out, 'Now I'm going to be sympathetic. I'm going to say so-and-so and I'm going to do so-and-so.' You must go about it in a more delicate way than that. Often sympathy can't be put into words. A look or a touch is enough.

A man who was a famous preacher tells that when he was a boy there lived in the next house a man who was a hopeless drunkard. The boy's father was very anxious that the man should be cured, and he tried all in his power to help him. But the poor man found it impossible to resist turning into a public-house when he passed its open doors, and saw its flaring lights, and smelt its smell of whisky. At last, after trying and failing again and again, he said to the boy's father, 'I think if I could hold some one's hand I might manage it.' The little chap heard this and was keen to help, so he offered himself for the job. Day after day he went and slipped his hand into that of the man and guided him safely past the danger spots. He didn't say anything. All he did was just to give a friendly grip; but it was the finest kind of sympathy, and it worked the man's cure.

Now a word of warning! Don't keep your sympathy for people who are sad or in trouble. Spare some of it for those who are specially happy or joyful. The Bible says, 'Rejoice with them that rejoice; weep with them that weep.' And you'll notice that it puts the 'rejoicing with them that rejoice' before the 'weeping with them that weep.' Perhaps that is because most people find it easier to be sorry for others' woes than to be glad at others' joys. I don't know why that should be, unless it is that there's a little bit of jealousy at the bottom of our hearts, and that little bit of jealousy comes up to the top when we hear of any one who has had any special good fortune.

Boys and girls, if you are ever bothered with that mean little feeling, give it no mercy, kill it right away. Do the sympathetic thing and the fine thing. Rejoice in your friend's joy. Here's the message of the topaz in other words, 'Halve your friends' sorrows, and double their joys.'

The Christian Year.

Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity.

The Election of Matthias.

'And they prayed, and said: Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen.'—Ac 1^{24}.

If a reason be asked for the particular character of this congregation, it is given in the first words of the text—*They prayed.* We can well understand why they prayed. The Bridegroom had departed from them. They were a band of mourners. There was Mary the Mother of Jesus weeping for her Son. And there was Mary Magdalene weeping for her Saviour; and Peter mourning for his denial of his Lord; and Thomas mourning for his faithlessness; all mourning for the brother who had fallen from his bishopric and gone to his own place.

Peter had important and very solemn duties to

fulfil. He began by preaching the funeral sermon of Judas Iscariot 'who was guide to them that took Jesus.' He then delivered the edict for the election of another apostle. Finding the warrant in the 109th Psalm, he read it aloud:—'His office let another take.' Thereupon he invited the assembled company to select one, who, along with the eleven, should be a witness to the world of the Resurrection.

Two names were put forward—two out of the seventy, very likely, whom Jesus had called and sent out to preach the good news of the Kingdom. Both men seem to have enjoyed the confidence of their fellows, and, though different, doubtless, in their respective temperaments, to have manifested such devotion to Christ and such zeal for His cause, that either gave promise of proving himself a worthy apostle. Their general qualifications for the office, the tone of their characters, that is to say, and the integrity of their conduct, had led to their being selected as a leet. It was a magnificent testimony for an hundred and twenty people to record about two of their number.

'They prayed,' Luke tells us, 'and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew of these two the one whom thou hast chosen, to take the place in this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas fell away, that he might go to his own place. And they gave lots for them; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles.'

However strange and unfitting a recourse to the lot in a solemn moment like this may appear to the Western mind, to the Jew it was a natural and reverential expedient.

But we must be careful to observe that the Apostles did not trust to the lot absolutely and completely. That would have been trusting to mere chance. They first did their utmost, exercised their own knowledge and judgment, and then, having done their part, they prayerfully left the final result to God, in humble confidence that He would show what was best.

The two selected candidates were Joseph Barsabas and Matthias, neither of whom ever appeared before in the story of our Lord's life, and yet both had been His disciples all through His earthly career.

And Matthias found himself (1) the successful candidate, (2) *the successor of Judas Iscariot*, (3) an apostle of Jesus Christ.

Of Matthias nothing further is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. This, however, is not surprising, for, with the exception of one or two incidents recorded of St. John, and the fact of St. James' martyrdom, the only acts of the Twelve commemorated are those of St. Peter. Clement of Alexandria quotes from the traditions of Matthias (*Strom.* ii. 163) and Eusebius (*H.E.* 25) mentions apocryphal gospels ascribed to Peter, Thomas, and Matthias, which implies that his name carried apostolical authority. It is remarkable, however, that in the earliest named groups of the apostles the twelfth place is taken by St. Paul. As an apostle of Jesus Christ he filled an office of great honour and privilege. Utterly unjust, surely, would be any account of the emotions which worked within him, if, besides the tempting whisperings of self-congratulation, and the salutary feeling of self-distrust, we failed to record the deep-seated solemn joy that he was no longer Matthias, but Matthias an apostle of Jesus Christ. The throne of Cæsar did not carry greater responsibilities; but neither did it cover its occupant with greater glory than the ministry to which Matthias was ordained. For the mighty empire of Rome was destined to flourish for a season and then decay; but the Kingdom of Christ, in the establishment of which Matthias was called to bear a pioneer's part, was to expand throughout the whole earth and endure for ever and ever. We are called to be witnesses of Christ to our generation. Who amongst us needs to be urged to embrace such a high privilege, and to undertake such a glorious office?

Twenty-second Sunday after Trinity.

Disease.

'Who healeth all thy diseases.'—Ps 103^3.

1. Disease is abnormal, because under fair circumstances the human being tends to revert to health. Over and over again, in the early days of our colonies, we have seen stunted, ill-thriven settlers with bad heredity rear a family of better stature and better health than themselves, and their grandchildren were observed to be again larger and more robust. Such reversion to health is only a dramatic instance of a scientific commonplace. We are warranted in setting down disease as abnormal.

2. All its abnormalities are—from the point of view of beauty, order, economy — disgusting. They mean, every one of them, that some stream that ought to be pure is impure, that some tissue that ought to be clean is unclean. In a diseased system the stream of the heart's blood, which ought to be cleansed by the exquisite respiratory process of oxygenation, is not cleansed, or some food which ought to be changing by a beautiful and delicate chemical process into clean living matter is, instead, decaying within the living organism, acting within the veins, or within the tissue, exactly as filth and decaying matter act in our streams or our streets.

If you think of a limpid stream running through a beautiful garden, and think of it again filled with the refuse of the slaughter-house, thick with the garbage of a village, its banks as foul as its water, evil-smelling, poisonous, you have a very good illustration of what food not thoroughly assimilated produces in the body, of what blood not thoroughly oxygenated is.

3. It is wasteful. For quite a long time now, every Christian society that sends out missionaries to do the highest spiritual work of converting men to the knowledge of God and building them up in that knowledge, has found it necessary to apply a strict physical test before taking any candidate into its service. This fact speaks for itself, and it is sufficiently obvious of every kind of religious and social service, except one, that ill-health reduces the working value of the individual.

The one service not thus impeded obviously is prayer; but it is a very serious question whether it has not been one of the greatest mistakes in religion to suppose that prayer can ever be as effective when divorced from social activity. We are ready now to hold this true of the prayer of the cloistered saint; it is no less true of such invalids as are his modern representatives. It is not in the effort to forsake the world for God that man has seen the truest vision of Divine Love, but in the effort to bring God into the world. It was the pagan idea that the body was the enemy of the soul that gave rise to the notion that the weak and sickly could exercise most perfectly the gift of prayer. While a diseased life that can know no other service than prayer may undoubtedly thus serve, it is also true that the same person in health, steadfastly desiring to pray, would produce better results. And to the waste of the patient's life we must add the tragic expenditure of time, money, and energy lavished daily in mere attendance upon the sick.[1]

Twenty-third Sunday after Trinity.

The Development of Personal Religion.

'How long will it be ere they attain to innocency?'—Hos 8^5.

Personal religion, if it is to be worth anything, must be progressive. It admits of advance and demands it. It is a principle, and must work. It is a power, and must have exercise. It is a life, and must grow. It may not stand still for a moment, either on its intellectual, or its devotional, or its practical side. Spiritual waxwork is quite as dead as any other waxwork, and far more ghastly. But what is a stationary personal religion but spiritual waxwork? What, however, are the conditions of the development required?

1. *Realization.*—It is with this that all true personal religion begins. The moment of trust is the moment of union. Then it is that the first flow of the life-sap commences, and the spirit of man receives its first true impulses Godward, from the Spirit of God. The sense of personal acceptance draws out affection. Love begets and increases love. The wilful sinner in the city becomes at once the willing servant at the Master's feet. Now if you check faith you check the flow also. The life is poor because the love is cold. And this is just what is happening to many. There is too little reality, because there is too little realization. Peace is essentially necessary to progress. No man works well in chains. If our personal Christianity is to be of a wholesome and vigorous sort, it must have its roots deep down in a consciousness of present forgiveness Short of this we shall only dwindle and shrivel up, and become the mere shadows of what we should otherwise have been. There would be more true personal religion if there were more of real personal resting on Christ.

2. *Faithfulness.*—A further condition of development, and so a further help to Godliness, may be found in Faithfulness. And by this is meant not so much faithfulness to convictions, or even faithfulness to truth, but rather the steady ongoing discharge of life duty. There is a religion of daily life which is quite as important as, and infinitely

[1] Lily Dougall, *The Practice of Christianity*.

more difficult than, the religion of daily devotion. It is not common just because it has to do mainly with common things. For to carry Christ into all companies, to cultivate the honesties of trade and profession whilst steeped to the eyes in business, to maintain a true morality in politics and public affairs whilst expediency is the order of the day, to make a conscience of the genialities and courtesies and unselfishnesses of social and family life, whilst self-indulgence and independence are the great gods of the age—in a word, to live out the second halves of the Epistles of the Imprisonment, and to move in man's world with a single eye to God's glory—all this may not amount to being great, but it is being faithful. It is the possession and exhibition of the mind of Christ. And such faithfulness, whilst it has regard to common things, has regard also to the things which are called little. With it nothing is really small, because 'all duty is one,' and because there is nothing into which God cannot be brought. And the inbringing of God at once ennobles everything, whilst the intention of pleasing Him at once consecrates every act and redeems it from the charge of insignificance.

3. *Fellowship.*—It was a wise saying of that prince of missionaries, that true exemplar of personal religion, Henry Martyn, 'May I never prefer work for God to communion with Him.' It is indispensable to the existence of all right godliness. For the life that God gives can be sustained only by that which God is. The spirit of man grows by what it is fed on, and its proper nourishment is the supply of the Spirit of God. For this we must walk, not only in, but with, the Spirit. Fellowship consists, not only in that which touches the devotional side of religion, the prayer, the praise, the participation in sacramental acts; not only in that which touches its intellectual side, the thoughtful study of God's Word, or the reverent observation of God's providence, but something beside and beyond it. It is personal intercourse with a personal God. It is the habit of speaking to Him as a man speaks with his friend. It is the looking to the unseen yet ever-present and abiding Comforter, as He joins us by the way. It is the listening to the unseen yet most impressive Teacher as He takes of the things of Christ and shows them to us, and especially at the Holy Communion. It is the leaning on the arm of the unseen but ever-ready Guide and Counsellor, as He says, 'This is the way; walk ye in it.' This is fellowship; where this is there is a growing acquaintance with God's character; a fuller knowledge of His glory in the Person of Jesus Christ; a clearer tracing of the finer lines of His truth, and with this a gradual transformation into His likeness. For if it be true that resemblance comes of lifelong partnership, if it be true that 'he that walketh with wise men shall himself be wise,' then he who companies with Jesus, he who walks with Wisdom itself, shall be changed from glory to glory by the Lord the Spirit. Union, communion, communication, these give a depth and force to all true personal religion.

4. *Expectation.*—We must have motives as well as means, and we find one in this—the hope of the Advent. If we are to live soberly, righteously, and godly (only another name for personal religion), we must look for the glorious appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ. For this enables us to deal with our specific hindrances. It is the thought of this Personal return, with its promises of rest, reunion, and reward, which helps us to purify ourselves even as He is pure. It acts as a lever to our affections, and also reminds us of things above; it throws its light on the true nature of heavenly things: it disillusionizes, it disentangles. It nerves under disappointment, it quickens in the face of difficulty. Above all, it delivers us from the paralysing power of sin, by revealing and bringing near to us the possibilities and power of the holy life beyond; and as there is not a hindrance which it cannot meet, so there is not a grace which it cannot assist. Take any feature of God's character which requires imitation, and you will find it urged and enforced in connexion with the paramount truth of the Lord's return. If then we are to live in the present that the future may be sure, we must also so live in the future that the present may be what it ought to be—holy, consistent, trustful, charitable.

There is a cry abroad that our religion is losing all its fibre and muscle, that it fails to supply a law sufficient for guidance; fails to grapple with the vices and follies of the day; is a sort of Christianity without much of Christ in it. This is not the truest way of putting the case, but it has some truth in it. Personally, we may need a reminder of a certain lack of strength. If so, we have to travel more from the Temple of the twelfth year to the house of Nazareth, from the carpenter's shop to the seashore of Capernaum, from the solitude

of the mountain to the solemnities of Calvary, if that strength is to be won. Let us take a fresh departure, remembering that Christianity is only a series of beginnings over again.[1]

First Sunday in Advent.

Vision.

'Your young men shall see visions.'—Ac 2^{17}.

The first Pentecost made Peter. He is no longer rash, impulsive, weak, but at once prudent, courageous, strong. No finer illustration of what Pentecost can do for a man is anywhere to be found. Pentecost makes ordinary men extraordinary, lifts the commonplace into the sublime, and transfigures daily drudgery with the splendour of Apocalyptic vision. Above all, Pentecost gives vision; and it is vision that makes the difference between one man and another, between one church and another, between one age and another, and between one nation and another.

1. The function of vision is to touch men to fine issues, to reveal the possibilities of their nature, and to give motive power for their realization. Vision is indeed the dynamic of achievement. You cannot do anything without a vision, not even an ordinary day's work. 'Where there is no vision the people perish.'

Moses beheld in the desert a bush burning with fire and not consumed, and in that day entered upon his life work. Nothing would ever daunt that man's faith, who for the briefest moment had caught the sheen of the Divine Presence. The rocks of the desert would yield water to God's people, and the skies drop manna; across the desert he would see the land flowing with milk and with honey and be content to die. For him henceforward the world was transfigured, and 'every common bush' was 'afire with God.'

His vision came to him in comparatively early life; and we of this generation have been witnesses of the power of visions to make young men willing to give their lives for an ideal even as Moses did. Our young men had dreams of bringing into the world more love, more truth, more justice, more courage, more purity: they saw a vision like the one Henry Martyn saw on his way to die at Tocaloj, 'a new Heaven and a new Earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.'

2. Mankind must ever see visions, must dream dreams, if it is to retain its pulse of youth and hope. Art must have made dreams—dreams of a light that never yet has been on land or sea, of a consecration that has never yet touched and mellowed the fair face of the earth. Art perishes if it is not bent on new ventures, if it is not busy with experiments beyond the borders of the country already won by the masters of other days. Poets, above all, must dream. They are those who retain their youth longer than the rest of us. And they must verify their youth, their child-soul, by confidence in their own vital spontaneity, by the unfaltering faith in their new and sacred gift, such as carried Wordsworth and Browning through the dark years when their voices slumbered in the ears of men and their message was as a tale of little meaning. Music must dream, for it is the very breath of the coming life that is still behind the veil, still in pause before the call, still expectant, still unformed, still unsounded, unmeasured, unfulfilled. Music in its yearning mystery prophesies of the secrets that are waiting to be revealed. Music must ever dream.

'Mankind must ever see visions, if it is to retain its pulse of youth and hope.' A lonely island is the annex of Heaven when a man has a pure heart. Sublime experiences come and go swiftly, but do not leave a man the same. The sun sets, but the afterglow remains. The vision is henceforward a light upon the man's path, and a burning hope within his soul.

What a wealth of glory may be poured into obscure lives, as when a highland cottage is filled with the light of the setting sun, because the window is open to the west! William Blake lived with his wife in two rooms, and when the fashionable world beat upon his door he saw it come and go unmoved. 'Leave me,' he prayed, 'my visions, and peace.'

And visions are often an uplifting power in a weary, prosaic life. They bring in the unseen world to redress the balance of the seen. There are two scales to the beam, one hanging on this side of the veil, full of tribulation, the other beyond the veil, weighed down with heavenly recompense.[2]

'Twas August, and the fierce sun overhead
Smote on the squalid streets of Bethnal Green,
And the pale weaver through his windows seen
In Spitalfields, looked thrice dispirited.

I met a preacher there I knew, and said:
'Ill and o'erwork'd, how fare you in this scene?'—
'Bravely!' said he, 'for I of late have been
Much cheer'd with thoughts of Christ, the Living Bread!'

O human soul! as long as thou canst so
Set up a mark of everlasting light,
Above the howling senses' ebb and flow,
To cheer thee, and to right thee if thou roam—
Not with lost toil thou labourest through the night!
Thou mak'st the Heaven thou hop'st indeed thy home.[3]

---

[1] H. James.

[2] J. Watson, *The Inspiration of our Faith*, 68.

[3] *Poems of Matthew Arnold*, 115; 'East London.'

3. But in many respects the Bible is the most alive and practical of books, concerning itself not with dreams, but with the waking realities of every-day life. We know but little of the writers of the books of the Bible. But we know this, at least, that they were not, as a rule, visionaries or mystics, living apart from their fellow-men in a sort of transcendental world.

Take, for example, the Hebrew prophets. Many of us find the utterances of the prophets exceedingly obscure and perplexing. But the reason of this is certainly not that they stood aloof from the world of men and lived in a dream-world of their own. Quite the contrary. If anything is certain about the prophets, it is that they were men of like passions with ourselves, born and bred in the midst of the people to whom they were sent, and in close touch with the movements and questions of their own age. Among them were men of action—counsellors of kings, statesmen, and social reformers—whose minds were alert to mark the changes both within and without, the hopes and fears, the troubles and the successes, that were stirring all around them.

'The prophets,' said Blake in the *Descriptive Catalogue* to his exhibition of pictures, 'describe what they saw in vision as real and existing men, whom they saw with their imaginative and immortal organs; the Apostles the same; the clearer the organ, the more distinct the object. A spirit and a vision are not, as the modern philosopher supposes, a cloudy vapour, or a nothing. They are organized and minutely articulated beyond all that the mortal and perishing nature can produce. He who does not imagine in stronger and better lineaments and in stronger and better light than his perishing and mortal eye can see, does not imagine at all. The painter of this work asserts that all his imaginations appear to him infinitely more perfect and more minutely organized than anything seen by his mortal eye.' 'Inspiration and vision,' he says in one of the marginal notes to Reynolds' *Discourses*, 'was then, and now is, and I hope will always remain, my element, my eternal dwelling-place.' And 'God forbid,' he says also, 'that Truth should be confined to mathematical demonstration. He who does not know Truth at sight is not worthy of her notice.'[1]

4. Visions belong to youth. Young men are lured to the study of politics through a vision. The victim of unholy ambitions had his days of wonder as he looked into the future and thought of the possibilities of his own nature. Bossuet, the great Bishop, was the writer who, at the critical moment in Napoleon's life, had 'touched the trembling ears.' 'The "Discourse of Universal History,"' says Lord Rosebery in 'The Last Phase,' 'had awakened his mind as Lodi awoke his ambition. On the fortunate day when he happened on the discourse, and read of Cæsar, Alexander, and the succession of empires, the veil of the temple, he tells us, was rent, and he beheld the movements of the gods. From that time in all his campaigns, in Egypt, in Syria, in Germany, on his greatest days, that vision never quitted him. At St. Helena it forsook him for ever.'[2]

How are we to preserve our spiritual vision to old age? Francis Thompson, that wonderful modern poet of mysticism questions his 'Mistress of Vision.'

'Where is the land of Luthany,
Where is the tract of Elenore?
I am bound therefor.'

She answers:

'Pierce thy heart to find the key;
With thee take
Only what none else would keep;
Learn to dream when thou dost wake,
Learn to wake when thou dost sleep.
Learn to water joy with tears,
Learn from fears to vanquish fears;
To hope, for thou dar'st not despair,
Exult, for that thou dars't not grieve;
Plough thou the rock until it bear;
Know, for thou else could'st not believe;
Lose, that the lost thou may'st receive;
Die, for none other way canst live.'[3]

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Blessing of Old Age.

'Your old men shall dream dreams.'—Ac 2^{17}.

There are two periods in human life to which dreams and visions belong—dreams and visions, at least, of any persistence and depth. They belong to young men and old men. The child has mere passing fancies, idle day dreams, brown studies. The imagination of the young man becomes strong—his visions project themselves and persist. During the strain and pressure of middle life the imagination loses its power, the routine of existence dulls the visionary faculty. But in the leisure and quiet of old age it asserts itself again. It would be more correct to say that the old man's power of dreaming dreams depends a good deal on the way the young man has used his power of seeing visions. If he has injured or wasted it, it may not return with any vigour; but if he has

[1] Arthur Symons, *William Blake*, 13.

[2] Lord Rosebery, *Napoleon: The Last Phase*, 159.

[3] Francis Thompson, 'The Mistress of Vision.'

not misused it, it tends to reappear. Young men naturally see visions, and old men dream dreams.

If any difference is intended here between the words 'visions' and 'dreams,' it is probably that visions imply the full activity of spiritual power more appropriate to the young, while the inspiration of men in calmer age is more fitly typified by the dreams that come at night when deep sleep falleth upon men. It will be admitted, I think, that the second part of the text is not so often fulfilled as the first. The dreams of old men are a more striking because a rarer sign of a spiritual outpouring than the visions of the young.[1]

1. It is no doubt the special province of the young to see visions. Youth is the time of courage and initiative. Visions are often little use to the aged, the spent, the weary. Age is apt to be unduly cautious; it sees a lion in the way. The young man says there is no lion, or if there is he is 'going' for it. The world is kept moving by the young; for theirs is the courage, the dash, the go, the initiative, essential to achievement.

It may be well, however, to remember that there are exceptions to the rule. In his diary Stopford Brooke wrote: 'I know so many old men who have much deeper feeling for life and keener desire to get out of it its treasures than the young men whom I meet possess. They are even more reckless than the young men. Whether this arise from many of them having no belief in immortality, and therefore being determined to wring the last drop out of the sponge of life—or whether it arise from their indelible immortality emerging amid the decay of the body—I do not know. But I do know it seems to me strange in contrast to the studied apathy and boredom of life which I meet so frequently among the young, and which bores me by its contact to extinction. Those follow the gleam: these never see a ray of it.'[2]

2. In old age beautiful things seem to speak more and more instantly to the mind. Perhaps the faculty of eager enjoyment is somewhat blunted; but the appeal, the sweetness, the pathos, the mystery of the world, as life goes on, fall far oftener and with far more of a magical spell upon the heart.

Just as we take a rambling walk because we know that a district is beautiful, so they indulge a rambling mind because they know that a whole existence is interesting. A boy does not plunge into his future more romantically and at random than they plunge into their past. Even the folds and stretches that our tired feet have left behind them become transfigured with exquisite beauty as we press courageously on and thread the labyrinth of life's long lane. The Present has a lovely way of wreathing an aureole about the brows of the Past. And even though the Present seems nothing but a dreary commonplace, the Future will do as much for her in God's good time. He maketh everything to be beautiful in its time; but it may not be the present time. To-morrow we shall see the glory of to-day. 'You always said my lane would turn,' wrote the 'Lady of the Decoration,' 'and it *has* turned into a broad road bordered by cherry-blossoms and wistaria.' It is always so. The birds in the hedges on either hand are singing that we really lose nothing that is behind by pressing bravely towards what lies before. All the loveliness of the lane is ours, even though we have nearly reached the end.

When well stricken in years, Victor Hugo remarked to a company of friends, 'Winter is on my head; and eternal spring in my heart. The nearer I approach my end the plainer I hear around me the immortal symphonies of the world which invites me. When I go down into the grave my day's work will begin again the next morning. The tomb is not a blind alley; it is a thoroughfare. It closes on the twilight to open on the dawn.'[3]

> Grow old along with me!
> The best is yet to be,
> The last of life, for which the first was made:
> Our times are in His hand
> Who saith 'A whole I planned,'
> 'Youth shows but half; trust God: see all nor be afraid!'[4]

3. The dreams of age, which are 'the true interpreters of its inclinations,' have as necessary a place in the development of the kingdom, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, as the visions of youth. Each in its own place is best; and the one is meant to supplement the other. No dream of age is to be all a dream. The dreams which are born from the brooding of age over the past are to be spiritually profitable. The dream stuff gathered from the past is to be transfigured in the light of the new revelation. The impulses awakened are not to melt away into thin air, but are to be transmuted into spiritual power to be

[1] H. W. Horwill, *The Old Gospel in the New Era*, 136.
[2] L. P. Jacks, *Life and Letters of Stopford Brooke*, ii. 471.
[3] J. M. Campbell, *Grow Old along with Me*, 26.
[4] Browning, 'Rabbi Ben Ezra.'

applied in the practical affairs in life. Ordinary dreams affect our waking thoughts; Spirit-born dreams affect them ennoblingly.

> That holy dream—that holy dream
> While all the world was chiding,
> Hath cheered me as a lovely beam,
> A lonely spirit guiding.

The golden dreams of age come from cherishing the golden visions of youth. The man who has been disobedient to the heavenly vision of youth, and has allowed his life to become sordid and commonplace, has nothing out of which to manufacture golden dreams when he is old. Every good old age must have had its vision, and must have held to it, and followed it, until it became a dream.

Prophetic souls who have moved the world have mostly, like Isaiah and Paul, been young men when they saw the vision that transformed their lives, and thrust them forth to their predestined task. And when they were old they doubtless dreamed the dreams which made their closing days the best; thus fulfilling in themselves the purpose of Christianity to redeem the whole of human life from unprofitableness, and through the Spirit's outpouring, by which young men see visions and old men dream dreams, to keep the life of age from thinning out, making it rather increase to the end 'with the increase of God.'

The Conception of a Finite God.

By the Reverend F. R. Tennant, D.D., Lecturer on Theology, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The word 'infinite' as applied to God or to His attributes is not a Scriptural term, although it has always been applied to the Deity in Christian theology. Even the almightiness, omnipresence, and omniscience, which have been asserted or implied in certain passages of the Old and New Testament writings, do not transcend the finite unless the world as created, indwelt, and known by God be assumed to be infinite. It is from Greek philosophy that Christian theology borrowed the word in order to apply it to God and His attributes.

Again, it may be observed that Christian or other forms of religious experience do not presuppose or involve the necessity of regarding God as infinite. The religious belief that to God our hearts are open and that from Him no secrets are hid, or that in answer to prayer He is able if He will to satisfy human needs, does not imply a Power more than *adequate* to know and to do what religious experience demands; and that is within the limits of finitude, however much it be. Hume and Kant made a point against the old cosmological and teleological 'proofs' of the existence of God when they remarked that we can never argue from any kind of effect to a cause greater than is sufficient for the production of that effect; and the satisfaction of the demands of religious experience is but a particular case of this general truth. God conceivably may transcend in knowledge, power, etc., the finite; but from the world or from our experience we cannot strictly infer that this is so.

Hence it may reasonably be asked whether the borrowing by theology of the idea of infinity from Greek philosophy was necessary or beneficial. And when we examine the various senses which the word has borne, it appears doubtful whether we can answer the question in the affirmative.

In ancient Greek philosophy, the source from which theology derived the concept, 'infinite' first meant boundless in the sense of essentially devoid of all defining limitations, and was therefore identical in meaning with the word 'absolute' in one of its current acceptations. In this sense 'infinite' was appropriated by gnostics and mystics, but not used, save perhaps very exceptionally, even by the platonizing Alexandrine Fathers. The second sense of 'infinite' with the Greeks was similar to that in which the term was used till lately in mathematical sciences, where it denotes the endless in space, time, or number: that which cannot be attained by successive acts of addition. This sense is again inapplicable to God, who is without

parts or magnitude. With Plato, 'infinity' came to mean perfection and immutability; and when borrowed with this signification it introduced into theology a tendency to doctrines incompatible with Christian and theistic faith. It was only when the word was deprived of its original signification of indeterminateness, and came to denote something determinate as well as surpassing all limits, that it could be appropriated at all by theology; and then only to describe the Divine attributes rather than the Divine Being Himself. Of late years mathematicians have invented a new meaning for 'infinity,' of quite a technical kind; but this does not lend itself at all to theology in that it is inapplicable to anything actual, and indeed only to classes, series, etc., composed of members within the realm of non-actual entities. Thus it would seem that the term 'infinite' has never borne any connotation which is at the same time definite and valuable, and throughout the history of its usage it has tended largely to be replaced by such terms as 'perfect' or 'eternal.' Theology can well spare the word.

On the other hand, it requires care when we would attempt to define the determinateness and limitation which we must predicate, instead of indeterminateness and infinitude, of God and His attributes. In a previous article it was argued that limitations were to be read into 'omnipotence' if without meaninglessness we are to retain that word in our doctrine of God. And the ideas of providence and purpose may similarly be shown to bespeak inherent limitation. Both, for instance, involve a relatedness to the time-process; and an 'increasing purpose,' a goal to which the world tends, implies distinction between means and end which could find no place in an unlimited mind with unlimited power, etc. From Origen onwards Christian theology has made use of the phrase Self-limitation, and has applied it in dealing with Creation, the Incarnation, human freedom, and other problems. The phrase is useful and fulfils a manifold need; and the only drawback to it is that it seems to imply a state preceding any act of limitation, or that God is what He is by His will and not by His nature. Perhaps this difficulty is not insuperable; but the problems to which it leads are too complex and difficult to warrant digression to discuss them here.

The attribute of omniscience perhaps also calls for qualifications such as those we found necessary when considering omnipotence. Omniscience, or knowledge of all there is to know, of course involves foreknowledge of 'free' actions; and this subject has received passing notice from one or two recent writers on Theism. Professor Sorley[1] sees no difficulty here: 'If we remember that the infinite mind is not limited to a finite span of the time-process, we must allow that, notwithstanding the free causation of finite minds, the actions which we call future are yet eternally present to his knowledge. To a mind which transcends time there cannot be the difference which exists for us between memory and foresight; the past and the future must be equally open to his view. Universal determination contradicts freedom; universal knowledge does not. And, if God foresaw, can we suppose that he would call into being spirits who would frustrate his purpose?'

But the chief difficulty seems in this passage to be passed over. It is accentuated, however, by another living philosopher. Professor J. Ward remarked in his work, *The Realm of Ends*,[2] that perfect knowledge at one glance of the whole of the temporal order, past, present, and future, is ill-called foreknowledge; it is rather eternal knowledge. And (*op. cit.* p. 473) he further observes, 'There is no contradiction in a complete knowledge of all that has been; for what has been is as fact equally real with what is. Why then should there be anything contradictory in a complete knowledge of the future? Well, if there were not, we should have to say with Augustine, *futura jam facta sunt.* But this is just what we cannot say; for it is an obvious contradiction.' 'Foreknowledge of the future' (p. 478) 'is, we may contend, something of a misnomer. It is either not strictly *fore*-knowledge or it is not strictly knowledge.' The Divine knowledge is to be distinguished from His *creative* intuition; the former does not posit or constitute its objects. The free creature's creations are not God's creations, and therefore, as Professor Ward says, we are not entitled to assume that they are part of His knowledge. He knows the tendencies and possibilities of human activity; He is beyond surprise, and His purpose beyond frustration; but as that purpose is to allow His creatures some initiative and to associate them as co-workers with Himself, it surely must imply some contingency, and some self-limitation in respect of knowledge of the particular

[1] *Moral Values and the Idea of God*, p. 472.

[2] 1911, p. 313.

forms that free action will take. Direct intuition of even a finite free agent's free acts, which are totally different from the mechanically determined movements of heavenly bodies such as astronomy can predict, seems to us inconceivable even for a Divine mind; and thus our freedom may be held to set limits to God's omniscience. This is part of His self-limitation, and therefore implies no derogation from His majesty or from His value for religious experience.

Indeed, the philosophical theologians who seem desirous to retain the conception of an infinite God, wholly unlimited as to power and knowledge, tend to identify God with the Absolute; to conceive of Him not merely as the Supreme Being, the Ground of all reality, but as inclusive of all reality. And this resolves the many into the One, finite spirits into adjectives or modes of the Divine Being. It is pantheism, and culminates in denying the applicability to God of such conceptions as personality, ethical goodness, etc. God as thus conceived then becomes useless for religion, unknowable, or indistinguishable from Nature. If human individuality be real, and freedom not illusion, then God cannot be the whole of reality, or an Infinite Being unlimited by the creatures He has made.

But to affirm that God is determinate, personal, limited as to power and knowledge in ways which we have seen He must be if His nature is not to be regarded as self-contradictory, is not to go to the extreme of conceiving Him as a finite being only somewhat better, wiser, and more powerful than ourselves. It is not necessary, in order to be able to think of God as actual and living, to regard Him (as he, Mr. Wells, seems to do), as a consciousness compounded of the best elements in our consciousness, and destined like 'the social mind' to extinction when humanity shall be no more. It is not necessary, again, to conceive Him as a struggling God who needs our help in order to achieve His purpose; as if the world, to contain a real moral issue, must be capable of defeating its Creator, and His triumph over evil cannot be depended upon until after the event. The doctrine propounded by Mr. Wells, indeed, leads to polytheism; for, as Dr. D'Arcy has remarked,[1] if a god be a collection of finite consciousnesses or a distillation of their better elements, there is no more reason why there should be one such rather than many, or why Athena should not be a reality rather than a mythical figment.

But Bishop D'Arcy's recent arguments against a Deity limited in any sense, against a God distinct from the philosopher's Absolute, do not seem to be cogent. Normal religious experience, as we have already seen, demands an adequate, but not necessarily an infinite, Providence; and the experience of the typical mystic, regarded by himself as a direct contact with the Deity, is expressible without the need of drawing a distinction between an infinite and a limited Being, although, to be sure, it has generally been interpreted by the mystic in terms of Pantheism rather than of Theism. Moreover though this great experience is very naturally expressed by mystics as a direct intuition of the Deity, the subjective facts concerning such experience can be psychologically explained without implication of any objective counterpart to it. Much so-called 'immediate experience' is really an interpretation involving complex mediation, and not pure and simple *datum*. The problem of evil, not to speak of other considerations, compels us to predicate limitation of a kind—such as is involved in all determinate being—of God; and the only alternative is an Absolute transcending all human valuations such as good and evil, and whose experience includes all our folly and wickedness and illusion.

[1] *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 1917–18.

Entre Nous.

SOME TOPICS.

The Expository Times.

THERE is encouragement in this letter, dated September 19, 1919, but there is something else, and it is for that something else that it is quoted here:

'After taking in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES from the first number, I felt I must write to you and express my gratitude for the help it has been to me during these years. I have been pastor here for thirty-five years, and during the last thirty years THE EXPOSITORY TIMES has been a constant inspiration both intellectually and spiritually. From no other source except the Bible have I derived so much help. Being pastor of a small church, with living now £130 and no house, you will understand how I look forward to it month by month, notwithstanding I have been able to obtain your DICTIONARY, 5 vols., and also CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS.

'I thought it would not be presuming too much to write and tell you this, as I had intended giving it up with the September issue, but after seeing your programme for the coming year it is impossible.'

Sympathy.

Elemental Drifts is the title of an anonymous booklet published by Mr. Stockwell (1s. 6d. net). It contains short paragraphs of which this is one: '"I told her," she said to me, "that there is something worse. It may have been selfish; it may have been cruel, but . . . it was true."

'"I have lost my son," she cried piteously, and looked to me for comfort. I had been her bridesmaid. "Is it for ever? Do you think I have lost him for ever?"

'"No!" I said to her. "Not for ever; you will find him again. But I can never lose a son to find him there—you have given your boy and it is agony, but would you change places with me?"

'"O happy mother! through all the anguish of your suffering heart, what is your grief to mine?"

'"And you said that to her," I exclaimed reproachfully, "at such a time!"

'"I may not have spoken aloud," she said after a pause, "for she kissed me."'

A Particular Providence.

In *The Coming Miracle* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net) the Rev. T. L. B. Westerdale gives us his interpretation of 'the great prophecy of Isaiah and Jesus concerning the Jewish race and its dramatic fulfilment in history.' He records this experience:

'For that sermon I had studied particularly two chapters of the Bible, the 7th of Daniel and the 16th of Revelation. From these chapters I believe we can discern the time in which we are living. "To know that time" is advice given to us by the Founder of my Church, John Wesley.

'After the service I went for a walk with my host, who was very kind to me, but who—I felt—did not accept a word of my message. Quietly he began to reason with me, and great fear fell again upon me. Had I done right? Had I obeyed the voice of God, or of my own imagination? What did the future hold for me if I pursued this policy? There would be no future for me in Methodism. I was told that very few of my brethren believed in a visible Second Coming of Jesus. People were already warning me that I should be regarded as an ignoramus, a foolish youth preaching obsolete old wives' fables, an "unsafe" man, a crank, hounding one idea to death, emptying churches, alienating sympathy, doomed to be side-tracked and useless. My dearest friends begged me to put away prophecy and get out into the fresh air. They said it was an evil thing and poisonous, and had ruined many men. And now I had preached on it!

'All these thoughts flocked into my mind as I walked along the road with my host, when suddenly I stopped dead, my eye fixed on a piece of paper lying there on the pavement before me. Something within me said: "Pick it up!" I felt it was an extraordinary thing to do, but I did it. It was a page from a Bible. One glance showed me that it was the 7th Chapter of Daniel! No other pieces of paper were lying about anywhere. Something said: "Keep it!" I did. The following Wednesday afternoon I was walking alone down a sandy lane near the village of Great Totham, thirteen miles from Chelmsford, and was again pondering over my extraordinary sermon of the previous Sunday,

wondering what would be the result of it, and whether any one would believe it, and whether I should have to do the same thing again in other places, and generally feeling miserable and ill at ease, when, suddenly, I again stopped dead, for there in the centre of the lane, a few feet before me, was a piece of paper—just one piece with no other pieces lying about anywhere. Something said: "Pick it up." I did. Imagine my amazement when I found it was a page from a Bible. *One glance showed me that it was the 16th Chapter of Revelation!*

'I put this piece of paper by the side of the other piece which I had kept in my pocket-book, and I have them to this day.

'*These were the two chapters I had studied for my sermon at Chelmsford!*' The 7th of Daniel and the 16th of Revelation!

'I stood there in the lane spellbound. Had Jesus Himself appeared and spoken to me I should not have had a stronger confirmation of my conviction that I had done right, and was obeying the voice of God, than I got in that moment.'

Gehenna.

Professor Paul Haupt has a note on Gehenna in the Report of the Johns Hopkins Philological Association for 1918–1919. As that official document is not likely to be accessible, we take the liberty of quoting it.

Gehenna, the Biblical name for the place of the future punishment of the wicked, represents the Aramaic form (*Gê-hennâm*) of the Heb. *Gê-hinnôm*, *i.e.* the *Valley of Hinnom*, south of Jerusalem. The final *m* was dropped in γέεννα. Similarly *Maria* is shortened from Μαριαμ; Heb. *Miriám*, which may mean *fat* or *milky*, milk-white (cf. Arab. *Mâriiah*). Mary does not mean Star of the Sea; *stella maris* is a corruption of *stilla maris*, drop of the sea, Heb. *mar-iam* (see *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xx. p. 152 n., *American Journal of Philology*, vol. xxvii. p. 162).

Hinnom is generally supposed to be a proper name. If this view were correct, the variants *Gê-ben-hinnôm* and *Gê-bĕnê-hinnôm*, the Valley of the Son of Hinnom or of the Sons of Hinnom, would be strange. *Hinnôm* may be the infinitive of the reflexive of Heb. *nûm*, to slumber, which is used in a number of passages of the sleep of death, so that *bĕnê-hinnôm* would correspond to οἱ κοιμώμενοι (1 Th 4^{13}) or οἱ κεκοιμένοι (Mt 27^{52}) or οἱ κοιμηθέντες (1 Th 4^{15}), which are used in the New Testament for *the dead* (cf. Syr. *dámkê*, the dead, lit. *sleepers*, and Jn 11^{13}).

It has been suggested that the name Αχελδαμαχ in Ac 1^{19}, which is explained to mean *field of blood*, signifies *field of sleep* = cemetery; but the final χ is as unwarranted in this case as it is in Σειραχ = *Sîrâ*; cf. the *r* in our *idear*, etc. (see Dalman's *Aramaic Grammar*, 1905, p. 202, n. 3). For the reflexive form *hinnôm*, to sleep, we may compare κοιμᾶσθαι, εὐνάζεσθαι, κατακλίνεσθαι, κατάζεσθαι, κατακεῖσθαι, κατῆσθαι, French *se coucher*, and Assyr. *utûlu* = *nutahhulu*, the reflexive of *na'âlu* = Heb. *nahál*.

Also Kidron, the name of the deep depression in the ground on the east of Jerusalem, between the Temple hill and Mount Olivet, seems to mean κοιμητήριον, cemetery; Heb. *qidrôn* may be a transposition of *riqdôn*, resting-place, from *ráqada*, which is a synonym of *nâma*, to sleep, in Arabic. Similarly Aram. *qidrâ*, pot, appears in Assyrian as *diqaru*. Arab. *ráqdah* denotes the time between death and resurrection. The Jews as well as the Christians and the Mohammedans of Palestine believe that the Last Judgment will be held in the Kidron valley, and it is the dearest wish of every Jew to find a grave there. The left bank of the Kidron, far up the western side of the Mount of Olives, is covered with the white tombstones of the Jews. Some Jewish teachers believe that the bodies of the righteous buried in foreign lands will roll back under the ground to Palestine to obtain a share in the resurrection preceding the Messiah's reign on earth (see Hastings' DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, vol. ii. p. 562).

The Kidron valley is called also the Valley of Jehoshaphat. This designation (which cannot be traced beyond the fourth century of our era) may be based on the fact that in the account of the Maccabean victory, given in 1 Mac 16^{9}, Simon's son, John Hyrcanus, is said to have pursued the Syrian invaders as far as Kedron. This, however, is not the Kidron valley east of Jerusalem, but the fortress of Kedron, the present *Katra*, south-east of Jamnia near the Mediterranean. The Book of Joel, which refers to a Valley of Jehoshaphat, was written toward the end of Simon's reign (about 136 B.C.), when King Antiochus VII. Sidetes sent his general Cendebæus against Judah (see Haupt, *Armageddon*, in the

Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. xxxiv. p. 412).

Both the Valley of Hinnom and the Kidron valley seem to have been ancient burial grounds. According to 2 K 23^{6} the graves of the common people were in the Kidron valley, and in Jer 2^{23}, $19^{2.6}$ the Greek Bible has for *the Valley* (of Hinnom) the rendering πολυάνδριον, a burial-place for many. In Jer 31^{40} we find after *the whole*, *Valley* (of Hinnom) the addition: [*with* = despite] *the dead bodies and the offal*, followed by *haš-šĕremôt* which is a corruption of *haś-śĕrefôt*, cremators, πυραί, πυρκαϊαί, Lat. *ustrinae*, *busta*. Heb. *śĕrefâ* is synonymous with *tofeth* or, rather *tĕfât*, the Aramaic form of Heb. *šĕfôt*, fire-place, ash-heap (see *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xxxv. p. 157).

The flaming pyres with the dead bodies of the apostate Jews, on which the Maccabees feasted their eyes when they went to worship JHVH in the Temple, were in the Kidron valley, between the Temple hill and Mount Olivet. There were plenty of corpses to feed the worms and the fires: *their worm died not, and their fire was not quenched* (Is 66^{24}; cf. Mk 9^{48}). Worshippers on the Temple hill could not have seen the corpses in the Valley of Hinnom. The two valleys have often been confounded: *e.g.* the great Moslem traveller Ibn Batûta (1304–1378) says (vol. i. p. 124 of the Paris edition) that the valley of Gehenna was east of Jerusalem. In the pre-Exilic period heathen images and altars were repeatedly cast into the Kidron valley and burnt there (cf. 1 K 15^{13}, 2 K $23^{4.6.12}$, 2 Ch 16^{15} 29^{16} 30^{14}). But on Doomsday the Kidron valley will see many of those who sleep in the dusty ground awake, some to everlasting life, and some to utter disgrace and everlasting abhorrence (Dn 12^{2}).

NEW POETRY.

D. F. G. Johnson.

The Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, tells us in an introductory note to *Poems*, by Donald F. Goold Johnson (Cambridge: at the University Press; 4s. 6d. net), that Mr. Johnson was a son of the manse, that he was educated at Caterham and Cambridge (where he won the Chancellor's Medal for English Verse in 1914), that he joined the Roman Church, and that he fell in France in 1916. 'A trench had to be held at all costs and the Germans prevented from advancing. Johnson without hesitation undertook the task but bade his friends good-bye, fully certain that he should not return.'

The poems written during the war are very different from the early poems. Not that they are either bitter or 'realistic.' They simply pass from play to performance, from indifference to responsibility. Some of them are absorbingly religious. In the 'Ode on the Resurrection' there is poetic power as well as piety. 'Victor Victima,' which we shall quote, at once finds a way into our hearts and may yet find a way into our hymnals:

Victor Victima.

O sov'reign Body broken on the tree,
Mine is the traitor kiss that hangs Thee there:
Yea, and the garden of Thy pale despair
My heart's Gethsemane,

That garden where, upon the darkling sward
Drunk with the greed of hell, the wage of death,
Stealing upon Thee, with her treacherous breath
My soul betrays her Lord.

Lo! mine the anguish of Thy piercéd side
My malice is that spear that woundeth Thee;
Yet for Thy recreant lover, Lord, for me,
In silence Thou hast died.

Still move Thy gentle lips to love and rue,
While round Thee mock the children of Thy pain,
'Forgive them, Father, for their hearts' disdain,
They know not what they do.'

Breathe now, dear Jesus, as Thy darkness falls
The peace no terrors quench, no pains dismay;
Bring me, all-crucified, with Thee to-day
Into Thy father's halls.

Leslie Hinchliff Winn.

Once more we have a volume of poems half war and half pre-war. And once more the war poems are the most momentous. For war like other calamities has the office assigned it of trying the hearts and reins of men. The pre-war poems in Leslie Hinchliff Winn's *Through Two Windows* (Palmer & Hayward; 2s. 6d. net) are of the country and the sea. The war poems are of the contemptible little army. The matter of death is imminent. This ode is slightly reminiscent of Blanche White:

If it were not that days arise from night
And fall again to night for quiet sleep;
If it were not that we can always creep
Into the velvet hours bereft of light,
Closing the house of thought to each delight
The day has given: or—if Earth did not sweep
Its silent orbit through enshadowed deep,
So eyes might see God's millioned candlelight!

We might have feared death's shadow-folded rest,
Thinking no dawn would glow of beauty's fire,
But every night we find by morning blest,
And all its hours are set with twinkling quire.
Day makes us long to lie upon night's breast
So, but for death, who would a life desire?

Norman Hugh Romanes.

These *War-Shrine Fragments* (Oxford: Gadney) are dedicated by Mr. N. H. Romanes to the memory of Lieut.-Colonel Maitland Hardyman, D.S.O., M.C., who fell leading his regiment to victory on August 24, 1918, aged 23. And although there are other poems in the book, the 'Fragments' are the best of it, fullest filled with poetic passion, best fitted with poetic phrase:

What then is their song's exultation as they pass through burning and slaughter?
Wonders of earth and sky and sea and river,
Field and mountain and flood, and light and darkness,
The hosts of heaven, the sunshine and changing seasons,
Winds and storms of God, the rain and thunder clouds,
White frosts and covering snows in winter,
All the beauty of earth their song and mine would celebrate.

And heavenly life they sing, the joy of every creature
Moving upon old earth or beneath her waters unseen,
Or wafted about the skies on happy pinions
Great and small, leviathan, tiniest insect,
The everlasting joy of all living things is in their song,
Last of all, most perfect, the spirit of man divine,
The high adventuring soul of man victorious,
The sorrowful, afraid, self-accusing, weak spirit of man.

Claude Houghton.

The title of Mr. Claude Houghton's volume *The Tavern of Dreams* (Grant Richards; 3s. 6d. net) is derived from the last poem in it, a dramatic poem in which the education of the voices that come with the wind through the fields is shown to be better than the scientific instruction that city life affords, though it is more perplexing in its purpose and more painful in its process. The shorter poems are experiences of a mind that has freed itself from the chains of rationalism but has not yet found the assurance of faith:

THE PALACE OF LOVE.

In the twilit land of Silence,
On the frontier of Death,
Love reared a mighty Palace,
(So an ancient legend saith)
Where the cypress tree and myrtle
Stood guardians of a gate,
Whereon was strangely carven:
'Who loves may laugh at Fate.'

In a starlit land of beauty
By a moon-made silver sea.
Joy thrilled the lilac shadows
With celestial harmony:
Dreams danced among the moonbeams,
Hope crowned the gliding hours,
And Love, asleep, lay smiling
Among the dreaming flowers.

Grief crept into the portal
Of the palace of Love's dream
When the young moon strayed in beauty
Through the starry skies agleam;
And upon the midnight magic
Rose a wondrous song of pain,
And Life was all its burden
And Death its deep refrain.

Then Love awoke and listened,
Then Love in silence wept,
And through the moonlit portal
With head down-bended crept:
And cypress tree and myrtle
Beneath the white stars' light
Saw Grief and Love together
Pass out into the night.

In a twilit land of Silence
On the frontier of Death,
There lies a mighty ruin,
(So an ancient legend saith)
Where the weeds and moss half cover
A lichen-mantled gate,
Whereon is strangely carven:
'Who loves may laugh at Fate.'

H. L. Hubbard.

The book of verse called *Epiphanies*, by H. L. Hubbard (Heffer; 2s. net), is a book of most melodious and most religious poetry. Let us no more complain of the dearth of sacred poets. We are now recovering the God we lost when the war began.

PURGATION.

I.

God held me in the hollow of His Hand
And smiled at me.
Through all the busy days I caught
The radiance of His smile: I faced the world
In the reflection of His light;
Upon my lips a song, deep in my heart a prayer
That through my life His light might tinge the world—
God was my all, and joy was everywhere.

II.

And then He turned His face away; the light was gone,
Gloom fell on all my life; I struggled to get free.
And in my struggle, I well nigh forgot
Where I was hiding, and who held me close.
God's face was turned, I knew not how He looked;
Pain sat enthroned upon my aching heart,
Dull, gnawing grief, and horrid darksome fear
Ruled all my life. The Crown of Thorns was mine.
Naked I stood and broken, waiting long,
Not knowing where I was, tortured with thoughts
Of what had been.

III.

And then at last I caught a glimpse
Of that averted Face.
I saw it mirrored in the smiling eyes
Of little children.
I knew the night had passed, and with the morn
Had come a joy, and that deep peace
That passeth knowledge, for I saw again
His Face: and lo, it bore the marks
Of all my struggles. He had borne them too,
And on His toilworn Face there lingered still
The impress of that wondrous tender smile,
More beauteous than before, telling of conflict past,
—Aye, and of victory won.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

MANY years ago a book was published with the title of *Letters of a Mystic*. It fell into the hands of one here and one there—we do not know how many—and became to them as a second *Imitatio*. The author was found to be the Rev. R. W. CORBET, M.A.

Where has Mr. CORBET been since then? What has he been doing? There are no other books. There is no record of any other activity. The answer will be that he is a mystic, and mysticism means meditation, not activity, and takes time. Now he comes again, and he comes with a book which may be to a new generation such a companion on the upward way as his first book was to those who discovered it.

The title is *The Message of the Gospel to the Twentieth Century* (Elliot Stock; 3s. 6d. net). It is commonplace enough. But it has a meaning. Mr. CORBET believes that there are two interpretations of the Gospel. We have been content with the lower interpretation until now. Now, in this twentieth century, we must attain to the higher. He writes the book with the express purpose of leading us to that higher interpretation.

Hitherto we have been dependent on creed and symbol: now we shall enter into fellowship with the indwelling Lord and Giver of Life. 'Experience teaches that there are two distinct stages in Christian discipleship called by the Apostles—Babehood and Adulthood in Christ: in the former we are under the teaching of the letter of ecclesiastical tradition, in the latter we are each one immediately guided by the inspirations of the spirit of our divine sonship. In other words, as "babes in Christ" we are under the tutorship of the Gospel expressed outwardly in symbols; as "adults in Christ" we enter into fellowship with Him who *is* the Gospel, and in heart and mind apprehend the inspirations He imparts, through obedience to their instructions.'

This inward and immediate apprehension of truth can be secured only by acceptance of the revelation and the grace which came to the world through Jesus Christ. For Mr. CORBET is a Christian mystic, and plainly acknowledges no other form of mysticism. All else is preparatory or disciplinary to that revelation. 'All outward law whether in the concentrated form of the Mosaic words, or in the distributed form of natural experience, stands as an outward pedagogue or tutor to lead us on through preparatory discipline to the one and only Lord, who by His indwelling Presence builds up in every man the sonly character that belongs to his being and is heir of its destiny.'

In this experience there are two stages. The

first stage is reached when we become conscious of the *solidarity of Humanity*. To reach it each of us has to die to or disown his psychophysical and isolated personality. For this ethical or personal death is necessary in order that we may rise into consciousness of a Christ-life that is in fellowship with our fellow-men.

The second stage is the recovery of our individual personality. This personality, however, is not our old psychological and solitary personality. It is a new spiritual personality, due to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, who, as the Lord and Giver of all life, enables each of us to *specialize* in the Spirit, ensuring for us that particular opportunity for service which is our peculiar destination, and enabling us to make full proof of our ministry. This is that gift of the white stone with a name engraved on it which no man knows but he that receives it.

'I will conclude my letter'—for this book also is written in the form of letters—'I will conclude my letter with a brief statement of what I feel we have come to see are the fundamental distinctions of the *natural* or psychophysical apprehension and of the *spiritual* apprehension of the Gospel: in other words, of the immature ecclesiastical apprehension and the mature apostolic. In the former we find a metaphysical philosophy based on *dualism*—an interpretation of miracle and sacrament which is *mechanistic*, and a conception of God which is *tritheistic* as expressed in the structure of its symbols of faith; while, on the other hand, in the latter we come across a monistic philosophy—an *ethical* interpretation of miracle and sacrament—and a conception of God that is *One* discerned by man in three modes of relationship and verified in personal experience by an ever-renewed fellowship in Light, Love, and Power with Him, who is the Source, Essence, and indwelling Energy of our being as Children of God. The transition from the natural order of Consciousness to the spiritual lies in and through persistent faith in the faithfulness of the Creator to His dependent Creatures and in the Record of His faithfulness disclosed to us in the Person and Work of the Incarnate Lord of all.'

Mr. Edmond Holmes has written a book and called it *The Secret of Happiness* (Constable; 12s. 6d. net). Is there not something odd, almost offensive, in the title? We have now for a long time been preaching against the pursuit of happiness. We have compared it with blessedness, as the earthly with the heavenly. We have contrasted it with joy, as a mere accident of life with an abiding, even an eternal, inheritance. And here is this author writing as if after all happiness were the last accomplishment of noble minds.

Mr. Holmes is an agnostic. Perhaps that is the explanation. There is no doubt that he is an agnostic. He says, 'God is the Unknowable.' And though he spells both words with capitals, he means all that he says. For he adds, 'God is the Unknowable in the sense that with regard to him every affirmation is a denial, every belief an infidelity, every dogma a blasphemy, every formula an outrage on truth.'

Being an agnostic, may he not be incapable of appreciating the difference between happiness and blessedness? We have just settled comfortably into that contentment when we come upon this passage: 'At the root of all religion lies the idea that self-sacrifice, leading first to self-loss and then to self-realization, is the supreme law of man's higher life. In feeling its way to this idea, religion has divined one of Nature's deepest secrets and discovered one of her paramount laws. For not only is it true that beyond a certain stage in man's development self-sacrifice is the form which growth necessarily takes, but it may even be said that something akin to self-sacrifice—the giving up of the actual in favour of the ideal—is at the heart of all growth. The highest motive to self-sacrifice, and the only genuine motive, is love—love of a person, love of a community, love of a cause, love of an ideal, love of Nature, love of Man, love of

God. The instrument of self-sacrifice is will. The energy of love sets in motion and sustains the energy of will. As religion purifies itself and widens its outlook, the idea of self-sacrifice ascends from man, the worshipper, towards God, the object of his worship, that it may re-descend—with a larger scope and a purer purpose—into the life of man. If man has indeed been made in the image of God, and if the capacity for self-sacrifice is the highest attribute of man, then self-sacrifice—the going out of self in order to find new life—must be of the essence of God. This idea is, I need hardly say, central in Christianity—central both in the teaching and in the life of Christ. His sublime saying, "Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it: but whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it," dominates all his other maxims. And his own sublime self-sacrifice is his true title-deed to Divinity.'

There is appreciation enough in that passage, and it is appreciation of the right thing. Clearly, whatever reason Mr. HOLMES has for setting out to seek the secret of true life and calling it happiness, it is not that he does not know a virtue when he sees it. He who can write in that way of Sacrifice is not the man to rest content with a low aim and its easy attainment.

We are at any rate encouraged to follow him a little further. If we follow him to the end this is what we find: 'Spiritual well-being is the summit and perfection of all well-being. The consummation of spiritual well-being is therefore the summit and perfection of happiness. The man who has found his true self in oneness with God has grown to the fulness of his ideal stature. He has carried the process of growing to the last term of its ascending series, and has therefore won the prize of supreme happiness, the prize which he set out to win.'

So this agnostic finds happiness at last to be only another name for oneness with God. And he finds more than that. For no sooner has he come to the conclusion that happiness is oneness with God than he discovers that the whole search for happiness has been a selfish search. And just when he has found his happiness he casts it remorselessly away.

The search for happiness, he says, has been carried so far that it has at last transcended itself. When a man has lost himself in love of God (that is the phrase he uses now for the oneness with God which he used before), when a man has lost himself in love of God the ideas of well-being and happiness retire of their own accord into the background.

He tells this story. 'More than forty years ago, when Moody and Sankey, the American evangelists, came to this country, a friend of mine who had come under their influence was in great trouble about his soul. He feared lest he should be "lost," and wondered how he was to be "saved." When he had confided his trouble to me, I tried to console him by saying: "What does it matter whether you or I are lost so long as it is well with God?" There our dialogue ended. My protest fell on deaf ears. I cannot tell how I came to utter it. I had no theory of things in those days which countenanced, or came anyway near to countenancing, the complete self-effacement that I advocated. I had never heard of Brother Lawrence, the Carmelite Monk of the seventeenth century, who liberated his soul from the haunting fear of being damned, by saying to himself: "Whatever becomes of me, *whether I be lost or saved*, I will always continue to act purely for the love of God." I can only suppose that my words surged up of their own accord from some occult depth of my subconscious self. But I think there was a deep truth at the heart of them.'

Is there any contribution to the difficult subject of Inspiration here? It is found in Mr. Charles GARDNER'S new book—his new book on *William Blake, the Man* (Dent; 10s. 6d. net). Mr.

GARDNER is the interpreter of Blake to some of those who have come within the sweep of that portent's peculiar power and charm. For he has already published *Vision and Vesture*. The new book is to be taken before rather than after *Vision and Vesture*. It is more occupied with Blake himself. And we must understand Blake himself if we are even to come near an understanding of his work.

Now Blake's work—but no, it is Inspiration we are to speak about.

There are two questions. The first question is: Do we find inspiration outside the Bible? Mr. GARDNER has no hesitation in saying that we do. Then the second question is: How does the inspiration in the Bible differ from the inspiration out of it? That is what Mr. GARDNER has to tell us.

He says: 'We speak of the true poet like Shakespeare, the true mystic like Blake, the true saint like Catherine of Siena, and the true Book like the Bible as all being inspired, yet in each case the inspiration is of a different order. The common element which justifies the one word is originality. Shakespeare's inspiration depends on the great Memory, on his own complex nature, and his consuming spirit of observation; but at the moment of his inspiration, all these things seem in abeyance, and the words well up as if a spirit not himself had given them to him. His originality consists in the unique impression that his rich understanding gives of the elements supplied by the Past and Present, but not in the creation of a new element. The same may be said of Dante, Milton, Shelley.'

There is a phrase here which needs explanation. What does Mr. GARDNER mean by 'the great Memory'?

Start with the recollection that in Greek literature the Muses are the daughters of Memory. For memory is the record of experience, and what is sung or painted is simply the present memory of past experience put into some artistic fashioning. Now Blake did not believe that. He held that the art which rested on memory was an art without inspiration. It is not the memory, he said, it is imagination that is the parent of true art, and imagination may be independent of experience.

But Blake did not despise memory. On the contrary, he gave it an honourable place in that spiritual city which he described in the astonishing poem called 'Jerusalem.' He gave it an honourable place and an honourable title. 'The Halls of Los,' he called it. And it is Yeats who has thereupon spoken of 'the great Memory.'

Return now to Shakespeare. 'Shakespeare's inspiration depends on the great Memory, on his own complex nature, and his consuming spirit of observation; but at the moment of his inspiration, all these things seem in abeyance, and the words well up as if a spirit not himself had given them to him.' How does the inspiration of the Bible differ from that? 'The inspiration of the Bible contains all these elements, which constitute its purely human side, but there is something else which has given it its supreme power in all ages. The writers of the Bible remember and observe and think, but they also utter themselves as they are moved by the Holy Ghost. It is this last mysterious happening that inspires the creative element. The inspired poet has aided his observation and experience by drawing on the great Memory, the inspired Bible has added to the great Memory something that was not in it before.'

The inspiration of the Bible, then, is unique. That is Mr. GARDNER's word. But Mr. GARDNER holds that the inspiration of William Blake, though it fell short of the unique inspiration of the Bible, was different in kind from, and higher in quality than, the inspiration of Shakespeare.

Shakespeare's inspiration depends on the great

Memory, his own complex nature, and his consuming spirit of observation. Blake's inspiration came direct from above. So he himself claimed; and Mr. GARDNER (most discreet of interpreters) is willing to admit the claim. But it did not come from the Highest of all. It did not come from the Holy Ghost. It came from certain spiritual guides, whose dwelling was above nature—say, in those 'heavenly places' to which St. Paul introduced the Ephesians—but who did not sit at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

The discovery of a manuscript is like the discovery of a star. It is made by the man who is on the outlook for it. Dr. Rendel HARRIS deserves the honour which we pay to Sir William Herschel. He is as highly gifted, as severely trained, as scientific in his method, and as successful. His latest discovery is as useful to the world as the discovery of a distant star. He has discovered a Book of Testimonies.

'Testimonies,' or, to give them their full title, 'Testimonies against the Jews,' are the first of all New Testament writings. They are older than the Gospels, older than the Pauline Epistles. By some strange providence, which we in our ignorance call accident, not one of them was included in the Canon of the New Testament, although many Testimonies, or many copies of one original Testimony, were at one time in existence. The result is that they were lost sight of by the Church. A scholar here and there knew them and quoted them, down to the invention of printing. But for many centuries now their very existence has been forgotten. Dr. Rendel HARRIS believes that he has discovered one of them in a manuscript on Mount Athos. He tells the story in a book with the unexpected title of *The Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net).

The Testimonies were books of extracts from the Old Testament. These extracts were made for the purpose of convincing the Jews of the truth of Christianity. So long as Christianity was making its way among the Jews it accepted the whole of the inspired Jewish Scriptures, but interpreted them in the light of the new revelation in Christ. It did not appeal to the light of nature, or to the teachings of philosophy. It quoted what Moses says in the Law, or David in the Psalms; it referred to the well-known words of one or other of the prophets. And it did all this for the purpose of convincing the Jews 'that this Jesus is the Christ.' The 'Testimonies against the Jews,' or, as an alternative title appears to have been, the 'Extracts against the Jews,' were the earliest Christian apologetic.

There are traces of the Testimonies in the New Testament itself. 'A comparison of the second chapter of the 1st Epistle of Peter with the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans will show a common argument underlying the two writers. Both of them affirm that Christ is the Stone spoken of by the prophets. Each of them illustrates the statement from Isaiah xxviii. 16 and Isaiah viii. 14. These passages are taken to show that Christ is the Foundation Stone laid in Zion, and at the same time the Stone at which the Jews, those unwise builders, have stumbled. So striking is the coincidence here, in the treatment of the subject, between St. Paul and St. Peter, that it has been taken as a final proof of the dependence of Peter upon Paul, and as a conclusive argument for the reconciliation of the two great early Christian teachers.'

'But we find similar arguments in early Patristic literature in writers who are not dependent upon the Epistle to the Romans; and we also find the fundamental position that "Christ is the Stone," sometimes in the form that "Christ is the Stone and the Rock," in the early collections of Testimonies which are extant. For instance, in the collection of Testimonies made by Cyprian against the Jews, one of the leading sections is devoted to the establishment of the doctrine that "Christ is the Stone," and the Old Testament is ransacked

for possible illustrations of the Christ-Stone or Christ-Rock. It is therefore reasonable to affirm that it was from such a collection that Peter and Paul took their doctrine and the quotations in proof of it, and not that either of them was borrowing from the other.'

The existence of such a collection of extracts from the Old Testament helps us to understand certain mistaken references to the Prophets which are made in the New Testament, and which have caused much perplexity to its interpreters. 'For example, in the opening of the Gospel of Mark, where the mission of John the Baptist is described, we are told in the oldest copies that it is written *in Isaiah* that the Lord will send His messenger before His face, and that there is the voice of one crying in the wilderness. Strictly speaking, it is only the second of these quotations that belongs to Isaiah, the first of them should have been referred to Malachi. Consequently, later transcribers have judiciously altered the words, "In Isaiah the prophet," to "In the prophets."'

In Mt 27^9 the prediction about Judas and the thirty pieces of silver is referred to Jeremiah. It is really a composite quotation, made up out of Zechariah and Jeremiah, and it would have been better, if a single reference was made, to refer it to Zechariah. Dr. Rendel Harris believes that Matthew took the quotation out of his Book of Testimonies. Thus a mistake, which has caused much searching of heart and not a little dishonest exegesis, is accounted for. 'It is easy to see that such mistakes in reference were almost inevitable in the use of the primitive Bible text-book, especially if the authorities were marked in the margin instead of in the text.'

The Christian Community.

By the Reverend John A. Hutton, D.D., Glasgow.

There is one thing about which the New Testament is decisive and incontrovertible—that Jesus founded a Church. And there is one thing to which the later books of the New Testament bear an equally decisive and incontrovertible testimony; it is that even by the time the canon was closed, there was, here in this world, an organic, self-reliant, sufficiently unanimous body which called itself the Church, which had the presumption, or, as we should say, which had the faith to believe that it held within itself the secret for the safeguarding and salvation of the human race.

Look at those two things in turn. There is one thing which so pervades the Gospels once one's eyes are open to look for traces of it,—it is the fact that Jesus took especial pains to gather round about Him a group of people. Accepting the narratives as they stand, and not trying to go beyond what is written, we cannot say on what principle our Lord selected those who formed the nucleus of the Church. Indeed, it would almost seem as, though the selection had been made with the very purpose of confuting any qualifying test which later on we might erect so that it might become a barrier to those who happened not to be able to answer that test.

You would not call them able men. You would not call them men of great insight; nor were they men of a natural steadfastness who could be trusted to stand fast in trying times. They were not all of one pattern. They were not men who showed any natural control of their own temperaments. They could be passionate upon occasion; they could be vain; they could be petty; they could be stupid. And yet, once more, the fact is that our Lord chose these men and on them He risked the future of His cause. He bore with their misunderstandings, with their unsteadiness. He did not dismiss them from His side even when, as He foresaw, they would leave Him at the last pinch. No; He seemed to be intent upon one thing only with regard to them, and that, as the narrative says, that they should be 'with him.' He never doubted that if they were

with Him during the length of time which God in His inscrutable counsel had appointed Him, thereafter though they might separate themselves from Him in an access of animal terror, the old days would gain upon them and they would come back to Him no longer dead, and would love Him for ever in God.

We turn to the other fact, which is the dominating fact of the later books of the New Testament: that even before the close of the canon, let us say, roughly speaking, about the year 100, there is already here in this world a Society, explain its origin and its intention as you will, which can use language and forecast a policy such as can only be justified by believing that that Society held itself to be founded and organized by God, and that it would survive the crises of history and the wear and tear of time.

There is a very precious counsel in Holy Scripture, that in times of misgiving it is wise to go back and consider the beginnings of things. I am thinking of the words, 'Let us hold fast the *beginning* of our confidence steadfast unto the end.' That counsel, I take it, is just this: in a time of misgiving, misgiving as to the future and prospect of any institution such as the Church, it is a reassuring thing to consider how the Church first came into being. For the reasons and causes which led a thing to come into being are the reasons and causes which shall sustain the thing in being. 'If there ever was one good man,' says Emerson, 'there will be another and there will be many.' If the Church arose, the Church will arise, and for the same reason.

I am never so depressed about the future of the Church as when I hear suggestions made for its greater future, suggestions which are not to be found in the New Testament. I see no future for the Church on any grounds other than the deepest grounds. It is only when I think of the Church as a tragic and human necessity, sustained by God for the relief and safeguarding of man's essential life, as a great gift to save us from the various despairs to which life in the long run reduces man, —it is only then that I have no fear.

There are three things that our Lord said about the Church; and when we read the later books of the New Testament we can see that the Church conceived itself as the trustee of Christ's very commission. The three things you will find in three well-known sayings of Jesus in which, to take the Gospel narrative as it stands, He confided to His disciples what their function in this world should be. We can hardly imagine that the early disciples understood at the moment what the words of Jesus implied; for later we find them guilty of a deplorably low ambition. But in that very circumstance there is another illustration of the value of saying great things whether people understand them or not. Perhaps people understand more than they understand; and the fact is that those early disciples later on recalled those great things which when they first heard them went beyond them.

'Ye are the salt of the earth,' said Jesus. That is to say, 'Ye are that element in life without which this whole human business will rot and go to pieces.'

Second, 'Ye are the light of the world.' 'Ye are,' that is to say, 'that element, that core of pulsating reality which, if you will not of your own wretched timidities restrain it, will radiate and urge man so that he shall go on, living to the height of his powers, and shall blame himself for every failure.'

And again, Jesus said, 'Whatsoever ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' 'Ye are,' that is to say, 'that living body whose very function it is to form the moral taste of the world, to create and to sustain within man a supernatural conscience. What you condemn, God will condemn even in the view of outsiders; and what you permit, God will ratify.'

Now the only ground on which we could set aside sayings of this kind would be, were we in a position to say that this whole idea of the Church assumes a certain helplessness in human nature by itself, or a certain wrong-headedness or even viciousness. Quite so! That precisely is what the New Testament does assume. Ten years ago, in the height of our colossal pride and ignorance, a man in my place, I myself an example, might have held some genial theory of human nature—that man was naturally good, and that what he wanted was to be free from the restrictions of external authority. I do not suppose we have many defenders in these days of that modernism which seems in the lurid light of the last five years so antiquated and preposterous, that man is a

quiet creature, safe, amenable, docile. Surely, if the aspect of things during the last five years and at this moment means anything, it means that there is something in man wild and savage, until it is controlled or cast out. 'Is not man naturally good?' James Boswell—a Scotchman too—said to Samuel Johnson—an Englishman forsooth; to which Johnson replied, 'No, sir; no more than a wolf!'

There is the paradox of Christianity, wolves that we are, 'Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called sons of God!' And the whole Christian business is—ways and means.

Personally, I see no hope of a revival until men make these things quite plain to themselves. I have not much faith in a loyalty to the Church, to the whole conception of the Church, which rests on side issues. Nothing in the long run survives except what is necessary; and nothing is loved with a passion that confronts death quietly, except something which is felt to be necessary and essential.

I have been staying for the last few weeks in Benderloch, on the north side of Loch Etive. The rock formation of that countryside is for the most part conglomerate. Approaching the little village, the road twines round the foot of an immense rock, Dunvallanree, which stands sheer and precipitous, and under the shadow of it one walks. Standing there one can see how that great boulder was created. It is typical conglomerate. Gravel, small boulders, large boulders, all obviously at one time rounded and separate, are held together in an indissoluble mass, so that that beetling face has withstood unworn the onset of Atlantic gales for thousands upon thousands of years. What brought that mass of isolated things together, and what held them together? Well, I know little of geology or of the formation of rocks, but I know this much: that what must have brought these boulders together and made of them one solid mass, was the effect of two events. First, there was obviously some great heat, some great warmth that melted what could be melted, and the molten element gathered round them all so that for a time it was one fluid mass. Then suddenly a great sea fell cold and hard upon that molten mass and congealed it into one compact thing; and there it stands.

The Church of Christ was formed and stands by the operation of two great movements; and the Church of Christ will continue to stand, and those who belong to her will be radiant in their confidence face to face with an ambiguous and disheartening world just so long as they perceive that the Church rests upon the same two movements, two movements which form the warp and the woof of the web of life. The Church was brought together and stands together by the force, first, of a great love, and, second, of a great terror. The warm love to Christ for what He was, for what we think we see in Him, that on the one hand; and, on the other hand, the terror of deep darkness, the awful sense of what a thing life is if Christ be not for us men the final truth.

It seems to me, looking back across history, and attending to the movements of my own spirit, in which, after all, history repeats itself—repeats in tiny wavelets in my own spirit what in large billows of the sea it manifests on the wide scale of history,—it seems to me that the whole art of life, the whole art of living believingly and joyfully, the whole art of recovering our confidence in the Church of Christ in this world, is the knowing where to put the accent between these two great movements. Not, indeed, that we can separate them for even a moment in our thought. And yet, there are times when one rather than the other is the thing we ought to emphasize. There are times when it encourages us and gives us a perfect confidence in the future to make clear to ourselves our reasons for gratitude to Christ, for what He is, and for what we find in Him. For what a place of love, of kindness, of tenderness, the Church of Christ with all her shortcomings is! Where else in this hard world are the poignant sorrows of the human heart honoured with such reverence and understanding, or credited with such significance, or comforted with such an interpretation! But there are other times when it helps us to appreciate all that with a sudden transport—as, for example, when we invite ourselves to reflect for a moment on what a ghastly and forlorn thing this life of ours would be, on what a ghastly and forlorn thing this life of ours indeed is, were the Church and all that it stands for conceivably eliminated or withdrawn.

> We mortals cross this ocean of a world
> Each in the average cabin of a life.

It is a fine thing far out at sea to sit together with some kindred spirits in some sheltered place, the lights on, the windows sealed, the doors fast closed, with all the illusions of perfect security. But it is not a bad thing for the human spirit, because it cleanses our souls of all the cloud of custom and insensitiveness; it is not a bad thing, I say, to leave that well-lit place of seeming security, and to go out on the deck alone, and to look over the side of our ship rushing through the dark waters.

Perhaps we are on the edge of a kind of shudder at things, which will only quiet itself again in the heart of the Christian community, on the breast of our Risen Lord. Even so, come Lord Jesus.

Literature.

A NEW COMMENTARY.

THE publication of a complete scholarly commentary on the Bible in a single volume is an event of the first importance. Its conception and its production are due to Professor A. S. Peake, though he has been assisted in editing the New Testament part by Principal A. J. Grieve. The title chosen for the binding is 'Peake's Commentary on the Bible,' but the title-page is *A Commentary on the Bible*, edited by Arthur S. Peake, M.A., D.D., Rylands Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Manchester; Professor in Hartley College, Manchester; sometime Fellow of Merton College, Oxford: with the assistance for the New Testament of A. J. Grieve, M.A., D.D., Principal of the Congregational Hall, Edinburgh (T. C. & E. C. Jack; 10s. 6d. net).

The first step in such an undertaking is to recognize the need for it. Now the need for a new commentary is always present. For to every generation the Bible has to be interpreted anew. There it is with its eternal appeal: its appeal has to be made effective by the commentator at every step in the march of time. In our day interpretation is the most urgent of all our mental necessities. A new commentary every ten years is the ideal. A new commentary now is indispensable.

The next step is to work out such a scheme as shall meet the need. Professor Peake, realizing that there was something both in the word and phrase commentary and in the paragraph commentary (usually called 'exposition') determined to combine the benefits of both. The text of the Bible is treated in paragraphs or passages; each passage has its meaning interpreted as a whole: and then within the paragraph the words and phrases are explained separately. The editor further resolved to furnish introductions to all the great divisions of the Bible—the Pentateuch, the Historical Books, the Wisdom Literature, and the rest—and to all the great aspects of the Bible as a whole—its Meaning, its Literature, its Land, its Canon and Text, and so forth.

The third step was to find the authors. And in this also the editor was highly successful. But it is just as important to find the right author for the right article or book as to find a good author. To offer an Old Testament scholar a New Testament topic in these days of specialization would have been as fatal as foolish. Professor Canney is no authority on the Fourth Gospel, nor would Dr. A. E. Brooke have been at home in Amos. There are no doubt men who have been driven to the study of the whole Bible indiscriminately, and a few of them have mastered every part of it well enough to be able to write unexceptionable articles or expositions; but they stand between us and that final authority on whom we rely. Dr. James Moffatt was the man for the Development of the New Testament Literature; Dr. William T. Davison for Hebrew Wisdom.

Finally, everything had to be laid hold of by the editor—proportion, fulness, accuracy, printing, publication. And it is all accomplished in such a way that the ideal of a Commentary has been probably as nearly reached in our day as at any time in the history of the Bible.

SOPHIA MATILDA PALMER.

Mr. Murray has published a Memoir of *Sophia Matilda Palmer, Comtesse de Franqueville, 1852–*

1915 (16s. net). The memoir has been written by her sister, Lady Laura Ridding.

Sophia was the third daughter of Roundell Palmer, first Earl of Selborne. Two daughters were older, of whom Laura married Dr. Ridding, Head Master of Winchester and afterwards Bishop of Southwell, and Mary married Earl Waldegrave. One daughter, Sarah (Freda), who married Mr. G. T. Biddulph, was younger. The only son, the present Earl of Selborne, was the youngest of the family.

They were all ordinary individuals, doing faithfully and fairly well that which it was their duty to do. Sophia was extraordinary. She never did what she was expected to do, but sometimes decidedly more and sometimes decidedly less. Her strong passions were often too strong for her. 'Not being liable to be shaken by sudden gusts of temper I could not understand my poor little sister's outbursts, and I used to witness them in petrified amazement. They were certainly odd exhibitions. She would fling herself down on the ground in paroxysms of passion, rolling over and over again, perhaps down a grassy terrace or into a flower-bed.'

But as the years passed her strong will, under God's grace, prevailed. She always did the unexpected, but it was now the unexpected more. 'Under God's grace'—most certainly. If ever a woman won by the grace of God it was she. She loved God passionately—there is no other word for it. And *in God* she passionately loved her friends—first her own family and household—she was never quite the same after the death of her nurse—then the labourers living around her home, and last of all, but passionately still, that French nobleman whom she married when she was over fifty years of age. Her husband was a widower with a family old enough to protest against the introduction of a second mother; he was a Roman also and all around him were Romans, she was an Anglican; but all opposition collapsed before the overwhelming force of her pure affection. When she died of cancer after some ten years' married life her step-children were her most inconsolable mourners.

All her life she was winning victories, first over herself, the hardest, then over others. How? By prayer, it seems. Writing to Lord Stanmore (Sir Arthur Gordon) she says, 'I think it is that I try (at least when I try) to use it, when I really pray, pray, pray—that is, you understand, not ask only, but cling to our Lord, besiege (so to say) God our Father, trust absolutely, make acts of faith and hope, beseech the Holy Spirit—then all becomes possible, even relatively easy; all seems to happen by itself. I have felt situations and causes and individuals desperately difficult; and then often wondered why, for solutions came, and so simply, that I felt as expressed himself to me lately a discoverer, Monsieur Gaumont: "Depuis que j'ai fait l'expérience, que je suis arrivé, que j'ai trouvé, je ne comprends plus pourquoi j'ai passé, onze ans à la recherche. C'est simple comme lait!" Well when he said: "Je ne comprends plus, etc." I felt, "that is just how I feel about what is called the Supernatural"—all which happens in the Kingdom of Grace is stupendous; and yet, now it seems to me, while infinitely gracious and loving, just as natural as Mother's and Father's love; and as the sun and all that is lovely in the world.'

Of her outward appearance this: 'At Royat, says her sister, 'I had opportunities of seeing my sister from day to day, such as I had not had for a great many years. In appearance she had developed rather than altered, from the eager, impetuous girl of forty years before. She retained the same grace, the same elastic stately carriage, the same air of personal distinction. Her long illness of 1901, and after, had set its ravages upon her face, had left a hint of pain which occasionally betrayed itself, but it had not robbed her of her enchanting smile which showed in delightful flashes the lines of her strong white teeth, neither had it dimmed the alert searching glances of her eyes. Her hair was as thick as ever, and had taken a very becoming grey tint. Time and sympathy had carved upon her face those lines which make an austere setting for nose and mouth, but which are only seen upon the faces of the unselfish and the holy.'

She lived as the early disciples lived. It is no surprise that she had visions and dreamed dreams. 'One of her visions was so beautiful that I cannot refrain from relating it. It occurred at the time of the death of Mrs. Aubrey Moore in Oxford in the summer of 1900. Sophia was continually with her young daughters during their mother's last hours, and it was to her that they turned for support and sympathy when they were left orphans. Among the sad duties of which she relieved them

was that of selecting the spot for their mother's grave. She was very tired and overwrought by all she had gone through with her friends, and she did not reach the cemetery till late in the evening. She arranged about the grave and returned home. That night in her bed she had a dream or vision, she could not say which it was. She thought that she was present at the Marriage of Cana in Galilee, and that, when our Lord gave the order for the water-pots to be filled with water and carried round, she had helped to fill the pots and to pour the wine out afterwards. When every one was served she wanted a tiny portion for herself, but she found there was none left. She sank down in a corner crying with disappointment. Then our Lord came up to her and found her weeping, and He told her not to weep, saying: "My daughter! The water of your love has turned to wine." Then she woke.'

PAPUA.

Papua—that is now the official name of British New Guinea. Mr. Wilfred N. Beaver's book, however, is called *Unexplored New Guinea* (Seeley; 25s. net). 'Mr. Beaver possessed great natural ability, and the experience he had gained in New Guinea in exploring expeditions and in dealing with natives, together with his studies of native customs, gave promise of still better work in the future. However, his patriotism and a desire to assist the cause of justice, peace, and humanity urged him to take part in the Great Adventure, and in so doing he paid the full price, the cost of which he had already counted, to the great sorrow of his relatives, friends, and comrades, to the impoverishment of the Papuan Service and to the loss of ethnology.'

That is the testimony of Dr. Haddon, who writes an Introduction to the book, and if you know any one who knows Papua and its explorers better than Dr. Haddon you might tell us.

The book is of quite exceptional interest and importance. To the casual reader of travellers' tales it provides abundant excitement. To the student of man, even to the most accomplished anthropologist, it offers information not elsewhere obtainable, for the Bush tribes of whom Mr. Beaver has so much to say have been very rarely visited and are as 'primitive' as any tribes on the face of the earth. Again, to the student of religion there is not a little of first-hand knowledge. Last of all, to the Christian Missionary and to the enriching of missions there are facts in this book that call for careful consideration.

One reads even yet in an occasional provincial paper that the religion of the native is the best religion for the native, and the more unaffected by Christianity the better. Very well: 'Nearly all these tribes are frankly cannibal. The arms, legs, and the breasts of women are esteemed the best portions, but the whole body is eaten roasted with sago. There do not appear to be any restrictions as to the eating of human flesh, even women are permitted to partake of it. The bones, the Bina people told me, are not thrown away but kept, probably for some ritual purpose.'

Again: 'A Masingara man was reported dead, and it was stated that four Podari sorcerers and one Glulu man had brought about his death. From the evidence brought forward in court later it appeared that the Podari party came down to Glulu, a small village a few miles from Masingara, where they obtained their accomplice. He seems to have been a tool more than anything else. They then went on to the Masingara village of Bulau by night and found their victim sleeping in his house. Charms were made against him, he was lightly struck with a large piece of a vine, which when dry has all the appearance of a human bone and is stated to be very strong medicine, and a piece of real human bone was pointed at him. That there should be no doubt about the result the Glulu man hit him on the back of the head with an axe. The most extraordinary thing about the whole case was that the latter incident was only introduced as a most minor detail, quite an after thought in fact. Every one seemed to attach far more importance to the sorcery as the actual cause of death. Next day the corpse was buried, but it appeared that the sorcerers returned during the night and consumed some portions of it.'

RACE AND NATIONALITY.

Great is the power of style. John Oakesmith, D.Lit., M.A., writes a book on *Race and Nationality* (Heinemann; 10s. 6d. net), a large book on a limited subject, and every person who cares to read books reads it with enjoyment. He possesses style.

A limited subject? No, it is limitless. It is in

its appeal that it is limited. For we have not yet realized that the League of Nations must have the mind of the nations behind it, and the mind of the nations must be educated. Two words have to be understood. The one is Honour, the other is Patriotism. They must both be snatched from the charlatan, whether military or political, and be taken for what they truly and finally represent. Dr. Oakesmith tells us what patriotism means.

Patriotism rests on nationality. What is nationality? What is it that makes a people a nation? That is the question to which this book is an answer. And first of all, it is not race. To prove that it is not race-heredity that gives a nation its sense of nationality, Dr. Oakesmith uses the first half of his book. What is it, then? It is environment. 'A nation arises when for a considerable time, allied by kin or not, people have been subjected to the same general environment. This identity of environment operates upon the natural capacity of the people so as to produce results in which they have a common interest. A fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind. A general tradition is formed, and gathers strength; other groups, from various causes, may be brought within the same sphere of interest; the nation grows and strengthens, and the process of traditionary consolidation begins and continues in the manner described. The common environment, in co-operation with the common intellectual and moral capacity, creates a community of interest, and, in proportion to the strength of this common interest in the common tradition and the common achievement, the national life is vividly felt and strongly expressed.'

'It must, of course, be remembered that environment is not simply the forces operating directly upon a people in its habitat. It is the whole of the influences operating upon it from whatever source. Every foreign invasion of England, whether military, commercial, literary or artistic, every enlargement of its horizon by increased facilities of international communication, has changed the English environment, and has thus added to the forces operating to produce national character.'

'The writer ventures to believe that the principle of organic community of interest, handed down, expanded, modified by progressive changes of environment, furnishes both a reasonable explanation of their existence and a legitimate ground for maintaining them. Patriotism is not only explicable as a national sentiment, but justifiable as a reasonable faith.'

ALEXANDER HENDERSON.

In choosing to write the life of *Alexander Henderson, Churchman and Statesman* (Hodder & Stoughton; 15s. net), Sheriff R. L. Orr has chosen to introduce us to a great period in the history of Scotland as well as to a great man. A Scot and a Presbyterian can write without faltering and even with fervour of the struggle which the Church of Scotland had with the autocracy of Charles I. and the bigotry of Archbishop Laud. And in the person of Alexander Henderson he has a man of whom every Scottish patriot can be proud.

Look at him that day he refused to dissolve the General Assembly at the King's command, disregarding the charge of treason and proceeding quietly with the business in hand. 'That,' says Sheriff Orr, 'was one of the great moments of history. "The moment at which Henderson refused to dissolve the Assembly at the demand of the king's Commissary," says Leopold von Ranke, "however widely the circumstances may differ in other respects, may well be compared with the first steps by which a century and a half later the newly-created French National Assembly for the first time withstood the commands of its king." And it was a supremely testing moment for Henderson. The eyes of the great assemblage were fixed upon him as he confronted the representative of royal power, knowing well what his refusal might cost. There he stood, a man not imposing in outward appearance, his stature under middle height, his countenance pensive and careworn; dignified, courteous, courageous. And there he stands in history, with the eyes upon him of all men who love liberty, honouring him for the blow he struck in its cause, and recognizing that in this man there is something of heroic strain.'

On an earlier page Sheriff Orr describes the part Henderson had in the framing of the National Covenant, and uses language as fervent and as true. Towards the end of the book he says: 'The National Covenant, for which he was so largely responsible, showed the true instinct of leadership in a great crisis. It was in a line with

the religious traditions of Scotland, and combined the appeal to religious and political motive which united Scotland as one man. The movement was led from first to last with remarkable skill, and it left its permanent stamp on the religion and politics of Scotland. The triumph of 1689 was still a long way off, but it anticipated that day and prepared the way for it.'

But of the Solemn League and Covenant he has a different opinion. He looks upon it as an error in statesmanship. 'It was entered into under serious misapprehension as to the state of feeling and opinion in England, and it was enforced in a way that wrecked any prospect of success it ever had.'

PHASES OF IRISH HISTORY.

What we are most in need of at this time of distress is simply more Christianity—a more faithful and practical following of Christ. That saved Europe once; that will save Europe again. Listen to this testimony of an unprejudiced witness. Mr. Eoin MacNeill is Professor of Ancient Irish History in the National University of Ireland. He has written a History of Ireland to the end of the Norman Conquest. He calls the book, modestly, *Phases of Irish History* (Dublin: Gill & Son; 12s. 6d. net), but it is truly a history; no essential fact or incident is omitted, and all is set down in order. More than that, it is an independent history, the well-considered product of a historian who at once reveres tradition and refuses to be bound by it. Still more it is a courageous history, the work of a historian who is not afraid to bring out of his treasures of research some things that are very new as well as some that are very old.

Well, this is his encouragement in the present distress. 'The condition of Europe at this time, the first half of the fifth century, is terrible to contemplate, and many must have thought that the ancient civilization was at an end. The Roman legions had abandoned Britain a prey to the Picts, the Scots, and the north-western Germans. Gaul and Spain were in the hands of the Franks, Burgundians, Visigoths, Alans, Suevi, and Vandals. Genseric, king of the Vandals, had overrun the opulent Roman province of Africa, which never afterwards recovered its ancient prosperity, and the greatest intellect of the time, St. Augustine, passed away in his episcopal city while the Vandals were besieging it. Rome itself was twice captured and sacked, first by the Goths and afterwards by the Vandals. Attila, the Scourge of God, led immense armies from one end of Europe to the other, and boasted that where his horse had trodden the grass grew no more. St. Patrick, in his Confession, relates that after his escape from captivity in Ireland he and his companions travelled for thirty days on the Continent through an unpeopled wilderness. It seems a miracle that hope and courage could have survived in any mind. Yet the spirit of peace and gentleness and mercy was stronger than all the violence and bloodthirst of all the nations. Some have complained that St. Patrick, in his simple narrative, tells little but his own heart, but his Confession is one of the great documents of history, and explains to us better than all the historians how barbarism was tamed and civilization saved. Imagine a young lad of tender years, son of a Roman citizen, torn away by fierce raiders from his parents and people, no doubt amid scenes of bloodshed and ruin, and sold into slavery among strangers; kept for years, the despised chattel of a petty chieftain, herding flocks in a bleak land of bog and forest. Think that the ruling sentiment that grew out of this pitiful experience was one of boundless love and devotion towards the people that had done him such terrible wrongs, so that when he had regained his freedom by flight, in nightly visions he heard their voices calling him back to them and freely and eagerly made up his mind to spend himself altogether in their service. It was this spirit that subdued the ferocity of fierce plundering rulers and warlike peoples. The Irish ceased from that time to be a predatory nation. Two centuries later, the king of the Northumbrian Angles invaded and devastated a part of eastern Ireland. His own subject, the Venerable Bede, denounces this violence done to "a harmless people who have never injured the English," and finds a just retribution in the misfortunes that afterwards befel the king and the Northumbrian power.'

Of the things in Professor MacNeill's book which will provoke discussion (but not dissension, since the Scots belonged then to Ireland) is his explanation of the name of the Scots. 'Whitley Stokes took the name Scottus to be cognate with certain Slavonic and Germanic words and to mean "master" or "possessor." But why should a

people who until the fourth century were named Iverni or Hiberni acquire in the fourth century a new name meaning "masters" or "possessors"? It is not in the quality of possessors that they appear in the records of the time, but rather in the quality of dispossessors. Raiding, fighting, wandering, wasting, these are the occupations of the Scots in that age; and if they acquired a new name, it is to these occupations that we might expect the new name to have reference. The verb *scothaim* or *scaithim* has a group of meanings all signifying a rapid cutting or striking movement. Dictionaries give the meanings, "I lop, prune, cut off, strip, destroy, disperse, scutch [flax], beat a sheaf of corn to make it shed its grain." *Scothbhualadh* means a light threshing; *scoithneán*, a sieve for winnowing grain. *Scottus*, then, in this view, was originally a common noun meaning a raider or reaver, a depredator who worked by rapid incursions and retirements.'

THE DRAGON.

We are singularly slow to admit the existence of a myth in the Bible. We feel as if it were the same as admitting a lie. Yet the myth may convey the truth more surely than the most exact scientific description. We need not really be offended therefore when we read in Professor G. Elliot Smith's book, *The Evolution of the Dragon* (Longmans; 10s. 6d. net), that in Rev 20^2, 'And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil,' we have the most fully developed form of one of the most widespread and instructive myths in the world.

But, in spite of the title, the book is occupied only in portions with the dragon myth. Its contents are miscellaneous, as the author acknowledges. They are no doubt bound together more or less firmly by one thought, the thought of water as the great fertilizer. But we come upon ever so many interesting and detachable things in our very pleasant journey through it.

The pouring of libations ('drink-offerings' is the name we are familiar with) arose from the desire to vivify the dry and shrivelled Egyptian corpse. This is Mr. A. M. Blackman's discovery, and it is accepted by Professor Elliot Smith.

Again it is Mr. Blackman's discovery that the offering of incense was originally resorted to for the purpose of restoring to the mummy the odour of the living body. It was part of the ceremony used to make the dead live again.

Once more: Professor Elliot Smith believes that Egypt is the source of the culture of the world, not Babylonia, and that the Egyptian culture travelled as far as China and became the parent of such civilization as that country attained to.

Last of all: 'It is hardly necessary to insist upon the vast influence upon the history of civilization which this arbitrary value of gold has been responsible for exerting. For more than fifty centuries men have been searching for the precious metal, and have been spreading abroad throughout the world the elements of our civilization. It has been not only the chief factor in bringing about the contact of peoples and incidentally in building up our culture, but it has been the cause, directly or indirectly, of most of the warfare which has afflicted mankind. Yet these mighty forces were let loose upon the world as the result of the circumstance that early searchers for an elixir of life used the valueless metal to make imitations of their shell amulets!'

FREDERICK THE GREAT.

If the man who with amusing French affectation signed his name 'Federic' was all that he is described in *The Life of Frederick the Great* by Mr. Norwood Young (Constable; 21s. net), and no more, then surely the title 'great' has never in the history of the world been bestowed upon one who was less worthy of it. Throughout the long persecution which he suffered at the hands of his father he bore himself contemptibly; yet how contemptible he could be in all the experiences of life was revealed when he came to the throne. His treatment of his gentle wife is dismissed in a few scathing sentences. More is said of the mean tricks to which he resorted in order to deceive the diplomatists with whom he had to do, and the incredible treachery of which he was capable in his relations with other Powers. Lord Hyndford, the British ambassador in Berlin, reports on 9th Jan. 1742: 'Upon all occasions he declares his disregard of treaties and guarantees, and the opinion that no faith or ties should bind a Prince any longer, when he is in a condition to break them to his advantage.' On the 17th May Hyndford writes: 'What dependence is to be had upon a Prince who has neither truth, honour, nor

religion? Who looks upon treaties as upon matrimony, to bind fools, and who turns into ridicule the most sacred things?'

That is the man and the manner which the House of Hohenzollern in our own day took as model of public spirit. He threw over the claims of morality as easily and as effectually as he had dismissed the demands of religion. To Jordan, the son of a French refugee, he wrote (in 1742): 'It will not be you who will condemn me, but those stoics whose dry temperament and hot brain incline them to rigid morality. I reply to them that they will do well to follow their maxims, but that the field of romance is more adapted to such severe practice than the continent which we inhabit, and that, after all, a private person has quite other reasons for being honest to those of a sovereign. In the case of a private person, there is nothing in question save the interest of an individual; he must always sacrifice it for the good of society. Thus the strict observation of moral law is in him a duty, the rule being, "It is better that one man should suffer than that a whole nation should perish." In the case of a sovereign, the interest of a great nation is in his care, it is his duty to forward it; to succeed he must sacrifice himself, all the more his engagements, when they begin to become contrary to the welfare of his people.'

No wonder Mr. Young says that at the beginning of the Seven Years' War 'his threatening demeanour, insulting hypocrisy and treacherous attempts to create quarrels, left him outside the pale of decent society.'

It is an unsavoury story. Ought it to be read in these days? We would seek peace and ensue it; this story moves to utter enmity. Note, however, one interesting quotation from Frederick's *Histoire de mon Temps* (left out of the official *Œuvres*): 'You have only to take in the hand a geographical map to be convinced that the natural boundary of this monarchy [France] seems to extend to the Rhine, whose course seems to be formed expressly to separate France from Germany, to mark their limits, and set a bound to their domination.'

THE ADVENTURER.

Dr. John Kelman, in his Yale Lectures, has been telling us that the preacher may find sermons in modern novels. That is encouraging to those who have not made much of it that way but have bravely persevered and still get through so many in the week. Notwithstanding Dr. Kelman, we would recommend the lives of adventurers. It is not that they are more truthful. For we have usually to depend upon their own 'Memoirs.' And in any case, as Pilate said, What is truth? It is because they are more entertaining. You see the man or woman, not as some one else feigned or fashioned them, but as they fashioned or feigned themselves. You have the adventure and the psychology all in one—and as in the case of that book of adventure written by Mr. Ralph Nevill and called *Echoes Old and New* (Chatto & Windus; 12s. 6d. net), you are really found face to face with a type.

It is the type that follows pleasure, the pleasure of the moment. It is said of Job that he feared God and eschewed evil. The adventurer fears God also, but eschews unpleasantness. That is to him the only evil in the world. He fears God, in his way. Casanova—the most entertaining of the adventurers in Mr. Nevill's book—'thanked God, "Cause of all cause," and congratulated himself' on the life he had lived, which (on the credit of his own 'Memoirs') was a life of debauchery and deception. His last words were: 'I have lived as a philosopher and die as a Christian.'

Mr. Nevill has much interest in the adventurer. Casanova never married. 'If, however, he never had a wife, he more than made up for it by being never without one or more mistresses. The number of these ladies as detailed by himself, probably with truth, for research has proved the famous Memoirs to be astoundingly accurate, was very great.' Whereupon the author says: 'Marriage and celibacy have both their drawbacks. Those of the latter state, however, are not without a remedy, which Casanova thoroughly realized.' Mr. Nevill's special aversion is the Empress Maria Theresa, 'whose fierce hatred of illicit love much resembled that of some of our modern Puritans.'

The other adventurers in the book are Henri de Lorraine, Cyrano, Gorani, Thomas Dermody, and La Paiva. There is some pleasant reading in the latter part of the book describing 'Some Aspects of Social England.'

OUR MYSTICAL POETS.

Mr. Percy H. Osmond is a student of mysticism. He has discovered a gap in the literature of that subject. And he has filled it worthily by his book on *The Mystical Poets of the English Church* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net).

He has quoted freely and commented fairly, and for both we thank him. Not cleverness but clearness is the great desire of our hearts when we read books about the mystics. That desire is as nearly satisfied in Mr. Osmond's book as in any work of the kind in English. And do not run away with the idea that clearness means shallowness. Mr. Osmond knows his subject very well. He quotes poems some of us have never read—poems that are worth our reading. He gives us not only his own criticism of the English poet mystics, but he gives us also a good opportunity of knowing their poetry and their mysticism for ourselves.

His judgment is good. Once only have we found him at fault. He has not yet discovered William Blake. How will he be forgiven for this: 'There is, no doubt, a good deal of affectation in the admiration so loudly voiced to-day both for Blake's drawings and for his verse. It is a little annoying to find people wasting time in the elucidation of his mystifying myths, taking his vagaries so seriously, and mistaking the ridiculous for the sublime'?

'I have often gone into churchyards, and even, when possible, vaults and charnel-houses, to try and hear the truth from the lips of spirits, to force the paraphernalia of death to unfold their secret: I have tried, oh, so earnestly tried, in utter faith to make the dead hear me, feel for me, comfort me. But the dead are deaf, or else too happy to listen. Don't think me mad: I am only human. You see, I *know* that there is a truth somewhere: I *will not accept it as a creed* of churches or philosophies. I will find it for myself out of myself: I believe in love as the key to unlock the spheres. Meanwhile, I must live a lonely life: life of art and patience: life of sympathy and self-reliance: but, above all, a life of unseen relations, of spiritual (call them chimerical) visions and intuition. I would not waste my strength in solving questions of my own propounding, but the wind, the air, dreams, all bring me questions and keep on waiting for answers.'

These are the words of a youth of seventeen, at the moment a scholar at Winchester College. A volume of *Some Winchester Letters of Lionel Johnson* has been published (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). Two wonders are in it—the maturity of the lad's mind and the uncertainty of his faith. He says: 'I could be a Baptist, a Romanist, an Anglican, a Mormon, with almost equal faith.' He did at last become a Romanist. It is one of the most perplexing and yet most characteristic signs of our time—this volume of letters. We are giving young men a hearing such as they never were given before—and to what purpose? 'I live,' says Johnson, 'in the age of the "Welt-Schmertz." I do no wrong; am I therefore ever happy? true, my sorrows never come from consciousness of wrong; but from the vague shadow of unrest thrown over life by passing things; "a death, a chorus ending."'

In the autumn of 1916 five citizens of Sheffield, 'desirous of a revolutionary construction of Society,' began an investigation into the present state of society in their city. They gathered other helpers round them. By the spring of 1919 they were ready to issue their first volume of materials. It is the first of three—the first to be issued, but the second in order of logic. The first in that order will be called 'The Education of the Workers'; this volume is called *The Equipment of the Workers* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net); the third will be called 'The Environment of the Workers.'

Visitors waited on the manual labourers throughout the city and asked them questions. The questions were always the same. They were divided into sections. The sections were headed thus: Adequacy for Home-life, Adequacy for Wage-earning Work, Adequacy for Local Citizenship, Adequacy for National Citizenship, Adequacy for Trade Union Membership, Adequacy for Co-operative Membership, Adequacy for the Right Use of Leisure, Love of Beauty, Love of Truth, Love of Goodness. Under each of these headings there were questions, again all alike. And in this volume we have the answers given to these questions by the manual workers together with the comments of the visitors.

The workers are divided into three classes—the well-equipped, the inadequately equipped, and the mal-equipped. Look at the answers of one of the

well-equipped, together with the impressions of the visitor.

'Aged 36; housewife and tailoress; lives at home with husband and eight children, and does her needlework there.

'Adequacy for Home-life. She likes her home "because all her interests are centred on it; because she has devoted all her energies to building it up." She is an "excellent" mother and a "devoted" wife. The condition of her home "decidedly" reflects credit upon her. She and her husband often talk about the children. She wants to keep them at school as long as possible.

'Adequacy for Wage-earning Work. She is physically fit "though suffering loss of vitality from years of overwork." "Is terribly weary of the endless stitching." "Wishes she could do more housework instead." She is "terribly regular," "marvellously industrious," and quite efficient, but "too tired for initiative." She is a good worker, because "she has practised self-discipline all her life—has gained philosophy—has a very affectionate nature which prompts her to work for others. She works sometimes from 6 a.m. when it is light, after she has set her husband off to work, often until dusk, stitching at button-holes; after which she often completes the family washing or does the baking, after putting the children to bed. She lays down her work to prepare dinner, etc."

'Love of Goodness [omitting all else]. Her ambition is "to see her children do well and grow up clean and happy." Her greatest pleasure comes from "the chatter of the children." She thinks "woman was made to be the helpmeet of man—her *own* man."

'Says the churches are "good places for those who have time to attend them." "Thinks Jesus Christ loves little children, and that they should love him. Can't feel he is a real person to grown-ups." "Thinks God is just, is above all, hears prayer, knows what we do and say." "Her religion is that 'we must try to be good, and especially to be kind to others.'" She knows practically nothing about the Bible, *e.g.*, she could not name any of the disciples.

'She submits herself to the Divine Will. There is some joy in her faith which makes her look forward hopefully. She is confident of the justice of the Almighty, and does not resent the hardness of her life in the slightest; she never makes comparisons between the hardness of her lot and the good times other people get; she says some people's lives have to be hard. She truly believes that 'God's in His Heaven, All's right with the world.' She says: "Just say a tiny prayer and get on with your work." She never grumbles. She was nearly heart-broken when she thought she was going to lose her husband through an accident, said they had never been parted, but without a word she got more work (charring) so that the children should not suffer and so that her husband might have luxuries. She never talks about anything she does, and never thinks herself at all wonderful.'

In the controversy between heredity and environment Dr. C. Lloyd Morgan takes no side. He is seriously impressed with the low condition of vitality and mentality in our great cities. In *Eugenics and Environment* (Bale & Danielsson; 2s. net) he urges that we must eliminate undesirables by encouraging the early marriage of the strong and discouraging that of the weak. But he will have us give still more attention to the social environment.

A brief biography of *Charles Annandale, M.A., LL.D.*, has been written by Hamish Hendry (Blackie; 5s. net). Blackie's *Imperial Dictionary* was in its day a marvel—however familiar and commonplace it may seem to be now in the presence of the *Oxford English Dictionary* and other mighty works. But the *Imperial* was only one of the great deeds which Dr. Annandale accomplished. We have always reckoned Blackie's *Modern Cyclopedia*, in its completeness and practical brevity, as useful a book as any in our library and have it always at our elbow.

Professor John Oman has revised his book *Grace and Personality* for a second edition (Cambridge: at the University Press; 7s. 6d. net). It says something for the perseverance of the saints that he has had the opportunity. For he is one of the most difficult authors of our day. Great thoughts come to him and in their due theological order, but he cannot give them expression. The chief if not the sole purpose of the changes which he has made on the book for this edition is in the way of clearing up its obscurities. For he has been well told about them. The new chapter which he has written, and which he calls 'Irresist-

ible Grace,' is written for the same purpose. And there is some result. But still the book demands the utmost attention. Only—and that is all we need to say—it is worth it.

A volume entitled *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Natural Knowledge* has been published in Cambridge at the University Press (12s. 6d. net). The author is A. N. Whitehead, Sc.D., F.R.S., Fellow of Trinity College and Professor of Applied Mathematics in the Imperial College of Science and Technology.

Dr. Whitehead describes his purpose: 'The fundamental assumption to be elaborated in the course of this enquiry is that the ultimate facts of nature, in terms of which all physical and biological explanation must be expressed, are events connected by their spatio-temporal relations, and that these relations are in the main reducible to the property of events that they can contain (or extend over) other events which are parts of them. In other words, in the place of emphasizing space and time in their capacity of disconnecting, we shall build up an account of their complex essences as derivative from the ultimate ways in which those things, ultimate in science, are interconnected.' More briefly (and near the end of a difficult discussion) he says: The aim of this work is to 'illustrate the principles of natural knowledge by an examination of the data and experiential laws fundamental for physical science.'

The difficulty of the discussion is undoubtedly increased by the singularity of the author's style. He has, for example, a peculiar use of the word 'namely.' There is an instance in the words with which the volume ends and which we shall quote. He is speaking of rhythms, and says: 'Molecules are non-uniform objects and as such exhibit a rhythm; although, as known to us, it is a rhythm of excessive simplicity. Living bodies exhibit rhythm of the greatest subtlety within our apprehension. Solar systems and star clusters exhibit rhythm of a simplicity analogous to that of molecules. It is impossible not to suspect that the gain in apparent complexity at the stage of our own rhythm-bearing events is due rather to our angle of vision than to any inherent fact of nature.' Then he adds: 'So far as direct observation is concerned all that we know of the essential relations of life in nature is stated in two short poetic phrases. The obvious aspect by Tennyson,

"Blow, bugle, blow, set the wild echoes flying,
And answer, echoes, answer, dying, dying, dying."

Namely, Bergson's élan vital and its relapse into matter. And Wordsworth with more depth,

"The music in my heart I bore,
Long after it was heard no more."'

To Messrs. Duckworth's series of 'Studies in Theology' a volume has been added on *The Theology of the Epistles*, written by Professor H. A. A. Kennedy, D.D., D.Sc. (5s. net). Professor Moffatt contributed a volume to the same series on *The Theology of the Gospels*. The two books go well together, by their contrast not less than by their agreement. It is incidentally interesting to notice that Dr. Kennedy uses Dr. Moffatt's translation of the New Testament freely. He agrees with Dr. Moffatt in translating 2 Co 4^6, 'It was God, who said, Light shall shine out of darkness, that shone in *my* heart,' though the Greek word is *our*. Both take the reference to be to the apostle's conversion.

The book is of the most exact scholarship and the most exalted loyalty. On every other page one finds refreshing thought or incisive interpretation. Thus: 'We are not unduly pressing the data when we assert that for Paul the conception of the Family of God, as established and knit together in Christ, takes the place of the Kingdom.' Again: 'Here we touch the very foundation of Paul's religious experience. The appeal of the love and grace of Christ, of which he became conscious at his conversion, penetrated to his inmost being. It set in motion all the activities of his soul. And this response, which carried his whole nature with it, he calls Faith.'

Way of Healing (Heffer) is 'a little book for those who know suffering,' gathered from writers ancient and modern, prose and poetical, by Estelle Blyth. Our first glance was unlucky. It was part of a poem by Christina Rosetti (so spelt) misquoted. It is the only misquotation or misspelling we can discover.

In *Every Church a Brotherhood* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net). Mr. William Ward tells the story of the revivifying of the Brotherhood Movement in Canada. He does more. He insists on

every Church being (not having) a Brotherhood. That is the significance of the book.

The Opinions of R. H. Brown, edited by his amanuensis, P. Addison Devis (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), have been read already by those who read the *Methodist Recorder*, and it is they first of all who will buy the book. For R. H. Brown has a clear mind and an obedient pen. He is a critic, a critic of religious people, and a sharp critic, and just for that reason he is to be read again and yet again.

There is, for example, that chapter on 'Peradventure.' The story comes from Prebendary Boyd. 'A poor woman was dying in peace because she had never uttered the unpardonable word. With great difficulty it was ascertained that this word of taboo and perdition was the harmless word "peradventure." She had read in the Bible, and laid deeply to heart, "If I say, Peradventure the darkness shall cover me," but she had never said it, and her conscience was at rest.'

The moral? It is well worked out by R. H. Brown and well driven home.

Mr. W. Scott Palmer believes that there is no essential antagonism between Science and Religion. More than that, he believes that religion ought to include both Science and Philosophy, otherwise it is not religion at its highest and best. His lively book, *Where Science and Religion Meet* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), has many acute and suggestive remarks in it for the instruction of the preacher, but its greatness lies in the argument (which never falters or grows stale as it pursues its way through the book), that the theologian who is not also a scientist and philosopher knows only half his business.

It is not a book of problems, but some of the most perplexing of our problems are discussed in it. The problem illustrated by the fall of the tower in Siloam on 'those eighteen' for example. The solution is that the tower was badly built and the eighteen suffered for the sin of the builders because of the solidarity of mankind—a solidarity which brings evil as well as good.

Mrs. E. S. Watson (Deas Cromarty) was engaged on a Life of Christ when she died. Her husband, the Rev. R. A. Watson, D.D., has edited and issued that portion which had been written. The title is *The Heir of All Things* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net).

It ends with the Temptation in the Wilderness, or 'the Confutation of Diabolus,' as the author calls it. For she is never content to repeat others' phrases or reproduce others' ideas. If she finds herself a Roman rather than a Presbyterian in holding that the 'brethren' of our Lord were His cousins, the sons and daughters of another Mary, the sister of the Virgin, and of Cleophas (called also Alphaeus), a younger brother of Joseph, she is not disturbed. She is not disturbed by a greater heresy than that, though this time her husband is troubled a little. For he acknowledges that the chapter on 'The World Unredeemed' is, 'from the point of view of current academic culture, somewhat heterodox.'

The War and Preaching is the title which Dr. John Kelman has given to the forty-fifth series of the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). The title does not cover the whole course. There are references to the war here and there, but really only two of the lectures deal directly with it. The book has a wider range of subject. It takes account of the Message, the Men, the Method, and the Messenger; and (to continue the alliteration) the Messenger is spoken of as a Politician, a Priest, and a Prophet. By the 'Men' is meant those to whom the Message comes. They are in this course of lectures the soldiers who went into the war. To them (for they were ordinary men) the preaching of the future has to be directed. 'It is our part to interpret the Kingdom of God both to soldiers and to civilians, and to do what we can to ensure that the reborn world of to-morrow shall be a world of righteousness and love, and not a world of hatred and of blood. The soldier who has discovered Calvary has also discovered the resurrection, if you will so interpret to him his just aspirations. If he rise with Christ, he will seek those things that are above. In the ruined and roofless church of Dickebusch, all the inscriptions on the walls are shot away except one. It is a little plaster circlet, remaining intact above the shattered altar, and it reads, "*Instaurare omnia in Christo.*" That is for an allegory of the war, if we have grace given us to make it so.'

This volume is an exposition of that form of

preaching which has made the name of John Kelman a household word on both sides of the Atlantic. What are the things necessary to the making of a good sermon?—plenty of material, careful construction, a feeling for style, and the vision. Yes, one more—imagination, both divine and human.

The latest addition to the Harvard Theological Studies is the text of seven unpublished homilies of Macarius, edited, with an Introduction, by G. L. Marriott, M.A., B.D., Lecturer in the University of Birmingham. The title is *Macarii Anecdota* (Milford; 5s. 6d. net).

A scholarly account of Ahmad, the latest Muslim Messiah, and of his teaching and influence, is given in *The Aḥmadīya Movement* by H. A. Walter, M.A. (Milford; 3s. 6d. net). The volume belongs to the series entitled 'The Religious Life of India,' which is edited by Dr. J. N. Farquhar and Dr. Nicol Macnicol.

There is a tradition among the Muslims 'that at the beginning of every hundred years a reviver (*Mujaddid*) would appear, who should revivify Islām and restore it to the pure principles of its founder.' And Ahmad's conviction that he 'had been chosen to fulfil a unique mission may well have had its inception in the growing consciousness, which appears early in his writings, that he was the divinely appointed reformer for the fourteenth century of the Muslim era.' The movement 'attracted those Muslims who, concerned alike at the inroads of Christianity and (to a small extent) of the Ārya Samāj from without, and of rationalism and worldliness from within, turned eagerly toward a leader who took his stand firmly upon Islām as a revealed religion, as being the supreme revelation of God to man, and, allowing no quarter to Christianity, pressed forward in unsparing attack, not, however, asserting the superiority of Islām on the ground of its rational character, but rather because of the authentic and conclusive nature of its divinely inspired revelation.'

Mr. H. Hamilton Fyfe knows his mind and can utter it. *The Meaning of the World Revolution*—the title of his new book (Palmer & Hayward; 3s. 6d. net)—is that war is to be no more because the people—not the higher nor the middle classes, but 'the people'—will not have it. They will have happiness, and war makes for misery.

They will have happiness; and 'I believe,' says Mr. Fyfe, 'the day is coming when each single human being's health and happiness will be the only aim worth considering.' Again he says, 'Charles Dickens wrote: "My faith in the people who govern us is, on the whole, infinitesimal. My faith in the people governed is, on the whole, illimitable." That must be the creed of all who can see things as they are to-day.'

The Religious Tract Society has published a Ground Plan with Brochure and Indexed Key Plan of *The Model of the Temple in the Time of our Lord* (1s. net). The author is Maud A. Duthoit.

Are the Pastoral Epistles St. Paul's? It has come to be considered unscholarly conservatism to say Yes. But the Rev. A. E. Hillard, D.D., is a scholar and up to date, and yet the title he gives his commentary is *The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul* (Rivingtons; 10s. net).

Dr. Hillard does not argue at too much length about the authorship. The Introduction is remarkably brief and to the point. He gives the space of his book to the exposition. And the exposition is not only full but also suggestive. Many topics are discussed with a wealth of illustrative detail rarely found in modern commentaries, and throughout the discussion many other topics are touched into life and suggestiveness. Within the notes on the first few verses of the first chapter of First Timothy there are discussions of Apostleship and Conscience quite fit to be considered Dictionary articles. And there is this note on the Greek work ἀγάπη.

'This word suffers through having no English equivalent, as the translations of 1 Cor. xiii. make manifest. At one time, perhaps, *charity* came near it, or Wyclif could hardly have written for Rom. viii. 39, "Neither death, neither lyfe, neither noon other creature may departe us fro the charitie of God"; but now the word is narrowed down and only represents ἀγάπη by a kind of convention. The word *love* also requires a convention to represent it, for it properly implies affection (φιλία), whereas you can have ἀγάπη for a person you have never met. ἀγάπη is essentially a Christian conception based on the common brotherhood in Christ and the consciousness of sharing the same

great object of life. It implies, therefore, all the consideration and sympathy that the consciousness of this bond creates. If a stranger wrote to you from the ends of the earth because he was in a difficulty and had no one to trust, having picked your name at random out of a list, you might take great pains in answering him, δι' ἀγάπην, but not out of love or out of charity.'

A new translation has been made and published of *The Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius of Loyola* (Scott; 9s. net). The translator is the Rev. W. H. Longridge, M.A., of the Society of S. John the Evangelist, Cowley S. John, Oxford.

'The book is an attempt to make the Spiritual Exercises of S. Ignatius Loyola better known to English readers, and especially to directors of retreats. It consists of a literal translation into English of the Spanish text of S. Ignatius, together with an explanatory commentary, some longer Additional Notes, and a translation of the *Directorium in Exercitia*.'

The translator says further, 'It would have been easy to give a more smooth and flowing English version by translating from the Vulgate, but this would have been, in many places, to paraphrase rather than to translate the original Spanish. It seemed best, therefore, in the case of a book where the language is so terse and full of meaning to keep as closely as possible to the actual words of the author, even at the risk of reproducing the harsh, and often ungrammatical, character of his style. Only so could the translation serve as a basis for the commentary which is intended to bring out and explain the meaning of the exact words in which he has expressed his thought.'

Most of us prefer a translation into idiomatic English; but with exceptions, and this is one.

The volume is divided into two parts — the Spiritual Exercises and the Directory. At the end of the Exercises there is a long series of Notes—most curious and most useful. At the end of the Directory there is an accurate and workable Index.

'A service of Sacrifice'—that is the phrase which indicates the attitude of the writer of *Some Thoughts on the Holy Communion* (Skeffingtons). And most eager he is to commend his attitude to others.

The brief story of a woman whom sudden bereavement sent into the world to win her soul and who won it is told in *Life's Realities* by A. Marett (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net).

The Importance of Women in Anglo-Saxon Times is the title given to a volume of papers by the Right Rev. G. F. Browne, D.D., formerly Bishop of Bristol (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). It is the topic of the first place but least importance of the five papers in the volume. But it has its present interest, and Dr. Browne makes good use of his opportunities always. His range of study is perhaps too wide to be deep, but he has discernment; he knows whom to trust. His aim is to make public that which is known to the specialist, and in that most important aim he is not easily surpassed.

The other papers are on the Cultus of St. Peter and St. Paul, the Early Connection between the Churches of Britain and Ireland, the See of Crediton, and Desiderius Erasmus.

One way of realizing the uniqueness of our Lord is to become acquainted with the mind of the Jewish rabbis. That is now easy for any one; Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley has issued a popular edition of the Pirke Aboth, or *The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, translated by himself from the Hebrew (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net).

First we are introduced to the Sayings in brief clear paragraphs, and then every Saying is explained and illustrated in full scholarly notes. Though far away from the mind of Christ, they are not all foolish sayings. Take this from Simeon the Just—probably Simeon II., high priest *circa* B.C. 226–198—'He used to say, "On three things the world stands: on the Torah, on the (Temple-) service, and on acts of love."'

The Rev. Charles H. S. Matthews, M.A., calls Jonah *A Hebrew Prophet for the League of Nations*, and under that title publishes a clear courageous exposition of the Book of Jonah (Student Christian Movement). There are good things in the exposition, but this taken from Cornhill's *Prophets of Israel* is as good as anything: 'I have read the Book of Jonah at least a hundred times and I will publicly avow, for I am not ashamed of my weakness, that I cannot even now take up this marvellous book, nay, nor even speak of it,

without the tears rising to my eyes, and my heart beating higher. This apparently trivial book is one of the deepest and grandest that was ever written, and I should like to say to every one who approaches it, "Take off thy shoes, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."'

'The existence of so admirable a Bible study textbook as Professor Hogg's *Christ's Message of the Kingdom* makes it necessary that I should offer a word of explanation for the *raison d'être* of this book. When Professor Hogg's book came out, I had been working along the lines here laid down for several years, first for myself, and then in small college circles at Oxford. We hailed Professor Hogg's book with joy, and used it largely as a circle textbook in Oxford. But I found myself that the book seemed to call for a companion or supplementary study dealing more in detail with the life of Christ.'

Those words, which stand first in the Foreword to Professor S. H. Hooke's *Christ and the Kingdom of God* (S.C.M.; 4s. 6d. net), are all that we need to understand its purpose. The fulfilment is found to be more than the promise. A scholar's most scholarly work, it is a trained and experienced teacher's most teachable material.

The Song of Songs has been translated by Gershon Katz from the Hebrew into rhymed English verse. The title is *Shulamit* (Universal Translation Bureau; 1s. 6d. net). This is an example of the translation:

Through th' windows looketh he forth, and him I see
Glancing through th' lattice, while he speaks to me
And says: 'Rise up, my love, and come away,
The winter and the rain have had their day;
The flowers on the earth appear; the time
Of singing birds is come; the turtle's chime
In our land is heard; the fig-tree green
Sweeteneth her good figs; the vines are seen
In blossom; tender grapes give a good smell:
Arise, my fair one, thou I love so well,
And come away.

To the second edition of their book *The Coming Polity* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. 6d. net), Mr. Victor Branford and Professor Patrick Geddes have added a wholly new part. Now the contents are: Part I. The Science of the Future; Part II. Method; Part III. Practice. The new part consists of three chapters, one on the Renewing of Christendom, one on the Post-Germanic University; and one entitled 'From the Old State to the New.'

The great idea and aim is still the Militant University, even though the chapter specially devoted to it in the first edition is now cancelled. But with the intellect of the University 'warmth of impulse and loftiness of aim are also needed and in fullest measure. An alliance of the University with the Church is therefore imperative; for assuredly no full-orbed society of nations is possible without that ancient mother, of whom Alma Mater is herself the daughter.'

Archibald Henry Sayce.

By Stephen H. Langdon, M.A., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

The subject of this memoir is a man whose literary and scholarly activity may be described as universal. Since the year 1871, when at the age of twenty-five he attained a European reputation by an article on Sumerian philology, he has constantly contributed to Oriental and Classical philology and to Semitic and Egyptian history and religion. For a period of nearly fifty years not one has passed without a book or important article from his pen. Their influence has been varied and profound.

Born in 1846 in the west country of Shirehampton, of Celtic extraction, he was educated at Grosvenor College, Bath. The Rev. Bradford Waring Gibson, Trinity College, Cambridge, was head master at that time. The principal interest of the master was mathematics, which may perhaps partially explain Sayce's aptitude for astronomy when he began the interpretation of Babylonian astronomical texts. He matriculated at Brasenose College, Oxford, in 1864, but was immediately

elected scholar of Queen's through the influence of two well-known classical scholars, Bywater and Pater. He obtained a first in Moderations and in the Final Classical Schools, graduating 1868 in the class of Andrew Lang, E. A. Knox (Bishop of Manchester), T. Humphrey Ward, and K. A. Muir-Mackenzie. Of delicate health he was compelled to spend one winter during his undergraduate days in the south of France. It is said by those who knew him in those days that this circumstance gave him opportunity for a wider range of reading than the severe Oxford system of examination usually encourages. He was elected Fellow of Queen's College in 1869, and did tutorial work in Classics and Theology from 1870 to 1879. He was acquainted with Mark Pattison and vigorously supported his crusade for the encouragement of research at Oxford. In fact, he consistently stood for the encouragement of original scholarship, and the result of his lifelong endeavour is that his own college has a great number of profound scholars and is renowned for its contributions to learning.

In 1871, when he began to publish, the languages and strange scripts of Western Asia were in process of being deciphered. Grotefend, Rawlinson, Hincks, and Oppert had founded the science of Assyriology by means of the trilingual cuneiform inscriptions of the Achæmenian Empire. The first of the versions was found to be Old Persian, an Aryan language whose affinities with Sanscrit were at once discovered and which soon gave up its secrets. The third version, largely through the remarkable ingenuity of Edward Hincks of Dublin University, was proved to be a Semitic language, that is Babylonian. The second version of these inscriptions was still more or less of a mystery in the early seventies. Its precise geographical relation to other languages remained obscure until 1885, when Sayce proved that it was written in the language of Elam, the native land of Cyrus himself. I shall return to this discovery later. The third or Semitic Babylonian version of the cuneiform royal inscriptions of the Persian Empire was by far the most important linguistic recovery of modern times. Here we obtained the key to the literatures of Babylonia and Assyria and several other peoples of Western Asia who made use of their language and script. George Smith, Edwin Norris, and others had already begun the publication of historical, literary, and grammatical texts, and much progress had been made in their interpretation before 1870. The linguistic character of the language spoken and written at Nineveh and Babylon was determined. The outline of their history was known and some of their great legends were vaguely understood. But the Babylonian inscriptions revealed the surprising fact that this most ancient of Semitic peoples had borrowed their system of writing, their culture, and most of their religion from an earlier and a vanished people whose language was a complete puzzle. Great numbers of bilingual tablets had been excavated at Nineveh and brought to the British Museum, and these were found to be lexicons and reading-books written to instruct the Semites in this ancient and sacred language. Oppert, Hincks, and others had already discovered its non-Semitic character, and this problem was the first one to which the young Oxford scholar consecrated his great linguistic ability. In the *Journal of Philology* of the year 1870[1] appeared an article on 'An Accadian Seal,' an inscription of twelve lines mentioning Dungi, king of Ur, who reigned 2456–2399 B.C. This was the first attempt to translate a classical inscription unaccompanied by a Semitic version. He was wrong in deciding in favour of Hincks' term 'Accadian' as the name of the language, for the future history of Assyriology was to prove Oppert right in describing it as Sumerian. But there was great controversy in those days between these two terms, and no one then could divine that the ancient city of Accad was the first Semitic capital in Babylonia and that Accadian really meant 'Semitic' as distinctive from Sumerian, the agglutinating language of the more ancient people in the extreme south. He nevertheless determined for all time the agglutinating nature of this language which we now call Sumerian, and fixed several of its grammatical rules and its phonetic peculiarities. His natural gift for phonetics is truly remarkable, far more so than his published works would lead any one to believe. Time and again the writer, in his endeavour to settle the phonetic system of Sumerian in a Sumerian grammar forty years after this pioneer work, found him a resourceful phonetician, ready to give invaluable advice concerning most difficult sound changes. If any one will take the trouble to read this now historic but naturally somewhat anti-

[1] The article is dated February 4, 1870.

quated article on 'An Accadian Seal' he will be unable to understand how any one at the age of twenty-four years could have done such a performance. It shows an intimate knowledge of the grammar and phonetics of Aryan, Semitic, Turanian, and the whole group of Asianic agglutinating languages.

In 1874 the ingenious Semitic scholar of Paris, Joseph Halévy, disputed the very existence of Sumerian, and explained it as cryptographic. The term finally employed was Allographie, and I still have by me a pathetic letter from that valiant but misguided *savant* which accompanied his last book (1912) on the subject sent to me. It has always been a mystery to the younger generation of Assyriologists how any one could have taken Halévy seriously. But many did, and even the distinguished Friedrich Delitzsch was deceived for a time. Sayce, however, like Jules Oppert, was far too good a linguist to be influenced by an impossible theory, and in his admirable paper on Sumerian phonology (1877) he made no reference to the attack on Sumerian, and, in fact, never has done so. To the great loss of Assyriology he broke off his Sumerian studies here and devoted his attention to other problems. He has, however, paid close attention to all the work which has been done, as those who know him can testify. Knowledge of Sumerian is absolutely essential not only for the interpretation of cuneiform texts, but even for Assyrian grammar. And so when in 1872 he wrote the first really comprehensive Assyrian grammar, his Sumerian studies profited him and Assyriology much. This was his first important work in Semitic languages, and reveals a good knowledge of that group. So far as I know we find here the first correct statement of the relation of Assyrian sibilants to the sibilants of cognate languages. That is, of course, one of the most important things to know about any Semitic language. In 1875 appeared his *Elementary Grammar of the Assyrian Language*, which passed into a second edition in 1876. At the same time he began to publish translations and interpretations of Assyrian texts chiefly in the first series of the *Records of the Past*, published by the Society of Biblical Archæology. In volumes i., iii., iv., v., vii., ix., xi., published during the years 1873–78, appeared translations of historical, religious, divination, and astronomical texts. Most of this material was revised and republished, together with many new texts, especially selections from the famous Amarna Letters, in the new series of the *Records of the Past*, 1888–92, six volumes, edited by himself, with the assistance of such scholars as Maspero, Amiaud, Pinches, Ball, and Rogers. His own contributions included one on Egyptian place names. He had, in fact, paid much attention to Egyptian and had studied under Maspero in Paris. The now famous Assyriologist, Père Scheil, was a fellow-student with him in Maspero's classes. The plan of the *Records of the Past* did not encourage exhaustive study of any one branch of literature, a most unfortunate circumstance for the future of Assyriology in England. But the series did spread abroad a knowledge of the subject and aroused great interest. Citations from the series occur abundantly in the theological literature of the period.

A long monograph on astronomical texts in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, 1874, pp. 145–339, was the first scientific investigation of Babylonian astronomy. The author shows a good knowledge of modern astronomy. It contains a résumé of all references to Babylonian astronomy and astrology in classical authors. In the light of our more scientific knowledge of Babylonian astronomy, which has developed into an exact discipline now, it would be distinctly unfair to criticise this pioneer work which began what turned out to be a complicated and very important subject. He foresaw, with the acumen usual in him, that astronomy was one of the fundamental elements in Sumero-Babylonian religion. We cannot interpret their vast theological system without it, and his *Religion of the Ancient Babylonians*, delivered as the Hibbert Lectures in 1887, shows that he appreciated this fact. Here we find for the first time the statement that the Babylonian (really the Sumerian) calendar originated in the period when the sun at the vernal equinox stood in Taurus. He placed the passage of the sun from Taurus into Aries in the twenty-sixth century B.C., but modern calculations place it at about 1900. Taurus is a long sign, and the sun entered it about 4500 B.C., and in that remote age the civilization of Sumer began. Having discovered that the sun stood in Taurus during the first month of the year throughout the period 4500–2500, he then explained the Sumerian name of what in the later period, about 2400, is the name of the second month *gud-si-di*, 'the directing bull.' Now when the sun passed from Taurus

into Aries naturally the first month became the second. In other words, *gud-si-di* probably was the name of the first month in the Taurus period, although it has not been found as such in that period. In short, this name, 'the directing bull,' for the month Nisan in the period when the sun stood in Taurus during that month is explained on astronomical grounds, and convincingly explained in my opinion. It is unnecessary to comment upon the acumen of a remark like that made at the very beginning of our studies on Babylonian religion. We cannot but surmise that the whole pan-Babylonian astronomical school of Germany, which sees practically nothing but astral religion in Babylonia, obtained their inspiration from Sayce.

In 1874 we find him attacking the second version of the Achæmenian inscriptions, which were obviously neither Persian (Aryan) nor Semitic. Now Layard had found cuneiform inscriptions in the plain of Mal-Amir on the road from Susa to Persepolis, and François Lenormant had published a few more of similar character from Susa. Sayce discovered at once that they were written in the same language as that of the second version of the royal inscriptions of Darius and Xerxes. The unknown language, therefore, was that of Elam. In *P.S.B.A.*, 1874, pp. 465–485 (separated at no great length from the monograph referred to above on astronomical texts), he fixed the character of this language and gave it the name Elamitic or Susian, which it has borne since. Again, at the Sixth Congress of Orientalists (1885), he read on the *Inscriptions of Mal. Amir* (vol. i. 639–756) a long monograph which is generally recognized as having fixed the direction which the new science must take. The excavations at Susa have produced an extensive literature of Elamitic, due almost exclusively to the work of one man, Père Scheil of Paris. It is not often that it falls to the lot of a scholar to determine the character of what proved to be a great language and historic civilization.

Sayce came early under the influence of Professor Max Müller and devoted apparently half of his attention to Aryan philology. He possessed a working knowledge of Sanscrit, was a splendid Greek and Latin scholar, knew all the important modern Aryan languages of Europe, and being of Celtic extraction was able to command the resources of that group in his studies in comparative philology. Not infrequently does he refer to Finnish and the whole Tartar group for illustration. In 1876, in a lecture on Comparative Philology, he insisted upon a most sound principle: 'Grammar and grammar alone forms a true basis for Comparative Philology. Mere similarity of roots is delusive.' Even at this time he was able to discuss the whole Aryan, Semitic, Celtic, and Magyar group. He became Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology (which in those days meant Aryan philology) in 1876. His *opus magnum* is *Introduction to the Science of Language* (1880), two thick volumes. *Principles of Comparative Philology*, published in 1874, which passed through three editions, was his first important book.

Undoubtedly his real interest from about 1885 turned toward the history of religion, especially the religions of Egypt and Babylonia, and in particular the religion of the Hebrews. His books on these subjects have had great influence, and have also been the subject of much diversity of opinion. *Religion of the Ancient Babylonians* (1887) was the first essay to outline the character of that great religion. It passed into six editions and was widely used as a text-book at the end of the last century. There is here no attempt to illustrate the religion of the Hebrews from this source. But in 1883 was published a small book, *Fresh Light from the Monuments*, in which the historical records of Assyria and Egypt were abundantly utilized to illustrate and confirm portions of the Old Testament. The school of Higher Criticism of the Old Testament were rewriting the history of the Hebrews and reinterpreting their religion in the light of literary criticism. It is difficult to state precisely his position in this controversy, which continues to the present day. His major thesis is that the literary critics fail to do justice to the historical surroundings of the Hebrew people in every period, particularly in the Mosaic period. *Fresh Light from the Monuments* passed through nine editions, 1883–95. There is no reason to suppose that Sayce at first denied the documentary composition of the Pentateuch. His opposition to the modern school of Old Testament critics is that they carry their analysis too far and greatly underestimate the literary character of the Mosaic Age. In his *Life and Times of Isaiah* (1889) he at any rate makes use of only chapters 1–39, and one concludes that he correctly sees the impossibility of attributing chapters 40–66 to that prophet. He employs prophetic utterances as legitimate

sources of history which proves clearly enough that he regards the Hebrew Scriptures as standing upon a different level from any other literature. His standard work on the Old Testament is *The 'Higher Criticism' and the Verdict of the Monuments* (1893), which passed at once into three editions. His attitude toward the Higher Critics is well stated there. 'What may be called historical hair-splitting has been the bane of scientific criticism. It has been mainly due to a want of sympathy with the age and writers of the documents which are criticised, and to a difficulty of realizing the conditions under which they lived, and the point of view from which they wrote.' In this book he massed practically all the known Egyptian and Babylonian sources illustrative of Hebrew history and followed it down to the time of Ezra. Archæology certainly vindicates his position about the possibility of the Hebrews having been able to write in cuneiform in the age of the Judges, and he insists time and again that there is a reference to the scribe and the stylus in Jg 5^{14}. Also in numerous articles on the 'Archæology of the Book of Genesis' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, he argues that the early Hebrew records were written on clay tablets precisely as the early Canaanites of the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries wrote their letters to the kings of Egypt, and, what is more, he believes that these tablets may still be found. That is an inspiring hope and a prophetic inspiration.

But increasing age brings ever a tendency to conservatism. In his *Early History of the Hebrews* (1897) he apparently denies the documentary analysis of the Pentateuch and defends the Mosaic authorship. Those of us who have been trained in the modern school of criticism find it difficult to follow him now, but it must be said that many exponents of this school unnecessarily aroused his hostility by persisting where he had proved them to be wrong. In consequence they are subjected to severe criticism in a little book *Monumental Facts and Higher Critical Fancies* (1904). Here he goes over to the archæological method as the only one possible in the interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures.

He is more and more drawn to pure archæology now, and in 1907 appeared an important book, *The Archæology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions* (Rhind Lectures at Edinburgh, 1906, with additional chapters). Here he shows himself thoroughly schooled in pottery, geology, glyptique, Babylonian art, and metallurgy. The special point of this book is to describe the culture of every one of the peoples who used the Cuneiform script, Sumerian, Elamite, Babylonian, Assyrian, Hittite and Cappadocian, Mitanni, Chaldian (Vannic), and Canaanite.

The Gifford Lectures at Aberdeen (1902) were on *The Conception of the Divine among the Egyptians and the Babylonians*. Here we have an eloquent expression of what every profound student of Egyptology and Assyriology comes to feel, namely, the preparation in these ancient religions for the preaching of the prophets and the founding of Christianity. '"God's light lighteth every man that cometh into the world," and the religions of Egypt and Babylonia illustrate the words of the Evangelist. They form the background and preparation for Judaism and Christianity. Christianity was the fulfilment, not of the Law only, but of all that was truest and best in the religions of the ancient world.' In his second edition, 1913, he recognized that the religion of Babylonia was too vast a subject to be dealt with so briefly. The writer painfully believes that Sayce greatly undervalued the ethical standards and religious rituals of Sumer and Babylonia, especially of the former. One of the desiderata of our literature is a book by him on Sumero-Babylonian religion in view of recent progress.

It is perhaps not generally known that Sayce is a preacher of marked ability. There is no better sermon in our language than the one preached at All Saints, Cairo, on Easter Sunday, 1906, and published under the title *The Preaching of St. Paul*. Paul spoke only of a risen Christ, God revealed in the flesh. He preached dogma and more than a personal Christ. 'Stoicism could point to an Epictetus and a Marcus Aurelius, but that is all; and Seneca's pupil was Nero!' 'It is only the few to whom virtue comes, as it were, naturally.' 'My own tutorial experience at Oxford led me to assign a very much higher value to what is commonly called dogmatic teaching than the theories of the study had inclined me to ascribe to it.' He has here, of course, the modern German theological school in mind which centres all upon the Person of Christ. He is far too good an Anglican and a Catholic to follow in that train.

I have left myself no space to describe even briefly his work on Herodotus (Books I.–III.,

text and commentary, 1883), and his *Ancient Empires of the East* (1884), in both of which he proves the inaccuracy of the Greek historian. In some instances Herodotus has partially recovered his reputation, for Sayce did not leave him much. However, so far as Herodotus was concerned with Babylonia, it is difficult to deny the full claims of Sayce's severe criticism. Still less sufficient is my space for an account of his decipherment of the language of the empire of Urartu whose capital was at Van in Armenia, in the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. Without any bilingual inscriptions at all, he made a fairly successful outline of the grammar and translated some of the inscriptions of that lost empire, whose people spoke an agglutinating language, and who preceded the Aryan race in that region. This remarkable linguistic feat was published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. xiv. (1882), pages 377–732. When de Morgan, and later Belck, found a bilingual inscription at the pass of Kelichin ten years later it was seen that his decipherment was in the main correct.

In the Amarna Letters, published by Winckler in 1888, he detected at once a long letter written in the language of the Mitanni, and at once set to work on that. Curiously enough, unknown to each other, Jensen and Brünnow in Germany each sent in to the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (1890) an article on the language of the Mitanni; all three appeared together. There was considerable agreement. Perhaps the most notable of all Sayce's achievements has been his persistent attempt to decipher the hieroglyphs of Asia Minor and Syria, commonly supposed to be Hittite. He began at this in 1876, and has published articles on this most difficult of all unsolved scripts continuously ever since. He assumed from the first that the language of the hieroglyphs of Hamath, Carcemish, and Karabel (in the west of Asia Minor near Ephesus) is identical with the language of the cunei form tablets of Boghaz-Keui in the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C. His method of determining the ideographic and syllabic values of these hieroglyphs is a long tale and difficult. A popular book by him on the Hittites is *The Hittites: The Story of a Forgotten Empire* (1888), which passed into three editions (1903). But he has made great progress since, and has now identified nearly all the signs and has translated some of the inscriptions. The present state of Hittite studies is too uncertain to permit of a popular résumé. His system is gaining ground and he is the only one who has succeeded in doing much with the Hittite hieroglyphs. In 1872 he worked at Karian, and published his results in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, a work which he pursued in another article, *P.S.B.A.*, 1886, 112–166. His work on this Greek alphabet has become one of the accepted acquisitions of Greek Epigraphy.

Even a bibliography of his books and articles would have filled all the space at my disposal. Perforce much is omitted. His travels and explorations have been extensive and always productive. Any one who wishes to see how brilliant he is in that line is referred to *P.S.B.A.*, 1911, 171–9, 'Notes on an Unexplored District of Northern Syria.' Here his journey from Aleppo to Carcemish, to visit the British excavations at the latter place, is described. Half a dozen Arabic *tels* are identified with ancient Assyrian names mentioned by Shalmanassar, and the geology and palæontology of the region are discussed in the manner of a specialist. The simple account of the work of A. H. Sayce requires no adjectival additions to describe his ability. He became Professor of Assyriology at Oxford in 1891, and resigned in 1914. In 1897 he succeeded Sir P. Le Page Rénouf as President of the Society of Biblical Archæology, a position which he held until that Society was combined with the Royal Asiatic Society (1918).

A raconteur of delightful tales, he possesses a mild humour which is rare in our day. A tale is told of his undergraduate days which may well end this all too brief and imperfect sketch. He belonged then to an exclusive debating society organized for semi-scientific purposes, but some of the members became dubious about its usefulness, and finally one of them proposed to debate on the question as to what the society really existed for. Sayce humorously defined the activity of the society as consisting in throwing pebbles into the ocean of infinity. It ceased to exist after that.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'The love of Christ constraineth us.'—2 Co 5^{14}.

This month I have been thinking of two birthdays. One was that of a Man—the greatest that ever lived in this world. The other was the birthday of a very good woman whose whole life was bound up in His.

The woman's life was bound up in His because she loved Him; and she spent her whole life trying to become like Him. She was born in a humble home in the town of Aberdeen one December day long ago. Her parents named her Mary. From the time that she was a very little girl her mother kept speaking to her about the wonderful One whose birthday was kept in the same month as her own. Mary heard about Him too at the Sunday school and at church.

She needed a friend. When she was quite young—younger than some of you—her father lost his situation in Aberdeen through drink. It was a sad time for the mother. One can picture her going about her household duties hoping against hope that better days would come; and when at last she grew weary with waiting, the father and the tired mother with their children, Mary among the number, set out for Dundee. Mary was the second eldest of seven, so you can imagine what the party of travellers looked like. It turned out a hard and somewhat hopeless struggle in Dundee. Delicate though the mother was, it was not long before even she had to go out to one of the factories in order to keep up the house, and when only eleven years old Mary was sent to earn her living. Such a little girl could only be what was called a half-timer; that is to say, she worked at the factory half the day, and went to school the other half. But she was clever, and of course she soon grew older. Before long she was a skilled and well-paid worker. Then, her hours were from six in the morning to six at night. All the time she kept thinking and thinking. She was conscious that she did not know much. Like David Livingstone, the great missionary, she carried a book with her to the factory, laid it open at her loom, and glanced at it in her free moments. She even read on her way to and from her work.

But though the home was a sad one, Mary always returned to it sure of her mother's love. The two loved each other all the more that they shared a sorrow with each other; and we may be sure that they never ceased to read and speak to each other about the Friend who became Mary's great pattern.

Thinking about Him, Mary forgot her sorrow, for her heart became full of sunshine. As she meditated upon all He had done for sinful men and women, and remembered His goodness to her mother and herself, she felt she could not do enough for Him. She became a mission Sunday school teacher. Later, she decided to be a missionary and offered herself for the work. Her offer was accepted, and she was sent out to Old Calabar on the west coast of Africa. There she showed how like her great Master she had really become. Her devotion to the savage people among whom she found herself was wonderful. She knew her Master loved them and their little children; and every one who has read Mary Slessor's *Life* knows what she did for the natives and for the little black babies of Calabar. It would be impossible for me to tell you how her gentle influence worked upon the people. Of one place she went to she wrote, 'I am going to a new tribe up country, a fierce, cruel people. Every one tells me they will kill me, but I don't fear any hurt.' Of course she told her Friend everything. 'My great consolation is in prayer,' she added in the letter. Patient almost beyond human endurance amidst all the horrors of savage life, she gained the love of those people who were like untrained children of the slums, but a thousand times more trying.

Occasionally Mary felt homesick. At Christmas, when some of her missionary friends came about her, memories of the old days and her home in Scotland floated through her mind. Do you wonder? But she was happy all the same. Once when she had had a specially delightful Christmas day and she felt her heart overflowing with love to her Master and to those about her, she said, 'Wasn't it good of my Father to give me such a treat?'

Doubtless she thought of the humble home at

Bethlehem where Jesus, her Master, was born. Mary Slessor's religion was one of love. She did not care for great learning. The one book never away from her was the Bible, and when she taught the young people hymns they were simple —just such hymns as you like. I know one Christmas hymn that she would have listened to with pleasure. It is a prayer. I shall read it to you :

Away in a manger, no crib for a bed,
The little Lord Jesus laid down His sweet head.
The stars in the bright sky looked down where
He lay—
The little Lord Jesus asleep on the hay.

The cattle are lowing, the baby awakes.
But little Lord Jesus no crying He makes.
I love Thee, Lord Jesus! look down from the
sky,
And stay by my cradle till morning is nigh.

Be near me, Lord Jesus, I ask Thee to stay
Close by me for ever and love me, I pray;
Bless all the dear children in Thy tender care,
And fit us for Heaven, to live with Thee there.[1]

The poor savages among whom she lived came to regard her not merely as a great Christian; they thought of her as a mother. 'Do not cry, do not cry,' said one of the native women when Mary was taken from them. 'Praise God from whom all blessings flow; Ma was a great blessing.' That might be considered humble testimony to her worth, but the Governor-General of Nigeria spoke of Mary Slessor as a heroine.

Let me read to you the closing words of the official notice of her death. 'Miss Slessor has died, as she herself wished, on the scene of her labours, but her memory will live long in the hearts of her friends, native and European, in Nigeria.'

So Mary Slessor really died a rich woman; although the little box sent home after her death contained only a few much-faded articles, there came with it a large packet of letters. These were from Government officials, missionaries, the mothers and sisters of the mission boys and little children. They revealed where her treasures on earth were stored—in the hearts whose love she had won.

She could not help being a missionary. She gave of her best to 'the Friend she loved.' To begin life with a great love in your heart means that when the call comes, you too will be ready to give of your best.

The love of Jesus Christ—what will not that make you do? Perhaps it will make you go to tell others of what He can do for them.

[1] Martin Luther, 'Cradle Hymn.'

The First Christmas Gift.

'They offered unto him gifts.'—Mt 2^{11}.

The happy Christmas-time has come round once more, and for the past few weeks there have been little under-currents of excitement in our homes. There have been wonderful mysterious secrets, strange whisperings behind doors, and swift hidings of little bits of work when mother came suddenly and unexpectedly into the room. And there has been much guessing, too, as to what Santa Claus will put into our stockings on Christmas morning.

Now if Jesus Christ had not come down to earth there would have been no Christmas presents. We give each other presents at Christmas-time because it is Jesus' birthday. Long ago the Wise Men brought Him gifts and laid them beside His cradle. But Jesus is no longer the Babe in Bethlehem. So instead of giving Him presents we give them to each other. And we know that when we are making other people happy we are making Him happy too.

I want to talk to you for a little about the Wise Men and their offering.

1. Who were these Wise Men? We really do not know. Out of the mysterious East they came, and into it they disappeared again. Some people say they were three kings who came to pay homage to the King of the Jews, and there is a wonderful legend of how in their old age they were converted to Christianity by the Apostle Thomas. The legend tells us that they went as missionaries to savage tribes, that they were put to death by them, and that, long afterwards, a Frankish king took their bones home with him and buried them in his cathedral at Cologne. But all we really know is that they were Wise Men and that they came out of the East to see Jesus. And that was the very best thing they could have done.

2. But what of the presents the Wise Men brought? Some people have found a special meaning in these three gifts. They say that the

gold was an offering to a King, and the frankincense an offering to God, while the myrrh was a gift for Christ's burial and foretold His death:

> Gold a monarch to declare,
> Frankincense that God is there,
> Myrrh to tell the heavier tale
> Of His death and funeral.

Perhaps people have got that idea from the purposes for which frankincense and myrrh were used.

Frankincense is a kind of gum or resin which is got from an Indian tree by slitting the bark. It was mixed with other things to make incense, and this incense was poured upon the offerings which were offered up to God in the Temple and was burned along with them. So the sweet odour of the frankincense rose to God with the prayers of the priests.

Myrrh is also a gum procured from a tree. It is a spice and was used as a perfume, and also in burying the dead. You remember how Nicodemus brought myrrh with him when he came to bury the body of Jesus.

Now I have said that Jesus is no longer a Babe in Bethlehem, and so we give each other presents instead of giving them to Him. But there are some gifts we can still bring to Jesus, gifts that He longs to have.

(1) We can bring Him *gold*. Gold stands for the most precious things. And what is the most precious thing we have. I think it is just our lives. So we can give our lives to Christ's service. We can help to fight the evil that is in the world and in our own hearts. We can help to make the earth better, and sweeter, and brighter. We can use the talents God has given us to make other people happier and wiser. And when we are doing this we are giving Jesus a gift more precious than gold.

(2) We can bring Christ *frankincense*. I think frankincense stands for prayers. And this is an offering Jesus dearly loves. When He was on earth He loved to have the little children gather round His knees, He loved to listen to what they said. And He still loves to gather them round His knees and to listen when they speak to Him.

(3) We can bring Him *myrrh*. Myrrh is used to purify and preserve, and so I think it stands for the things that are purest and most lasting. And what is the thing that is purest and most lasting? I think it is just the love and devotion of our hearts. For love has conquered sin and death, and lives for ever and ever.

There is a beautiful legend which tells how a little girl in Bethlehem took Jesus a Christmas present. She had heard the story of the Wise Men who had come from far to see the Baby King. And she, too, longed to go and see Him. But she could not visit a king without taking an offering with her, and she had nothing to offer, for she was very, very poor. So she went out with her little bare feet and crept up close to the inn where the Baby was sleeping. And as she stood there in the cold snow she wept because she had nothing to give Him. Then as she wept, out of the snow grew a beautiful white flower whose petals were flushed with pink. It was the first Christmas rose. And the little girl heard a soft voice speaking to her. It was the voice of an angel, and it asked her why she was so sad. She told Him that she longed to see the Baby King and that she had nothing to offer him. Then the angel showed her the beautiful flower that had blossomed at her feet. He bade her pluck it and carry it to the King; and he told her that the beautiful white flower was her pure desire, and the pink flush her heart's love for the Baby.

And that is the gift that Jesus values more than any other—the gift of our love. We may have nothing else to give Him, but if we bring Him that He is content. It is a poor, shabby, little gift at the best, but He does not think it poor or mean. He prizes it above all others, and He glorifies it and makes it beautiful and pure.

The Wise Men came from far to see Jesus, but we have no distance to go to give Him our offering, for He is here in our midst to-day. Just think how glad He will be to tell the angels who sang at His birth, 'I have received the very best Christmas present to-day, for a little child has given Me himself.'

Coral.

'They traded with . . . coral.'—Ezk 27^{16}.

Here is December, the last month of the year, and it brings us to the last stone in our imaginary talisman. What do you think I have chosen as the last jewel? Why, the very first gem that a child wears—one that I expect most of you knew by sight before you knew it by name—I mean the coral. It used to be the fashion to give babies a

bit of coral to bite on, so that it might help their teeth to cut the gum, and one of the nicest presents for a baby girl is supposed to be a string of coral beads.

Well, I can't tell if you have any corals of your own, but if not, very likely some of your little friends have a string, and at any rate you know corals when you see them. Do you know their story too? It is a sea story—and as wonderful as any fairy tale.

Long, long ago people used to be very puzzled about coral. They thought it was a flower of the sea, but how it came to be so hard they could not tell. The fishermen who brought it up in their nets from the bottom of the ocean said that was easily explained. The coral was soft so long as it was under water, but the moment it reached the air it turned hard as a rock.

But there was one man who wasn't satisfied with that explanation, so he hired a diver to go down and examine the coral at the bottom of the sea. The diver came up and reported that the coral was every bit as hard there as it was above water. When the good man heard this he was so anxious to see if it were true that he actually went down himself to prove it.

Nowadays, thanks to him and all the other wise folk who have studied the subject, we know that the coral is not a flower. It is the skeleton of a little sea animal called a polyp. When it is born this little animal is like a soft pear-shaped piece of jelly. But it doesn't remain long like that. It fastens on to some object on the floor of the ocean—a stone, a bottle, a bit of wrecked ship, or even a cannon ball. Then it begins to grow and harden and spread itself. It draws out of the water carbonate of lime—the stuff of which the oyster makes the pearl—and from the carbonate it grows its bones or frame. It first spreads into a dome shape like an orange cut in half, then it shoots out one little horn after another, till there is a perfect rosette of horns or branches growing from the dome, or foot, as it is called.

But there are corals of other shapes besides the rosette. There are some which look like huge sponges, only you had better not try to wash your face with them! There are others which are fan-shaped, and still others which grow like a set of organ pipes. Some have long branches like the branches of a tree, others still are not unlike a large cauliflower. And you should just see the colours!—green, white, red, pink, yellow, and black. They make the bed of the ocean look like a gorgeous garden.

Those of you who are fond of stories about pirates, and the South Seas, and treasure trove, have often read of coral islands. Well, these coral islands have all been built by the industrious little coral polyps. Though they are so tiny they have built a reef of 1000 miles in extent along the north-east coast of Australia.

The red and pink gem coral does not come from the South Seas. It is found in the Mediterranean, chiefly off the coasts of Sicily and Corsica. It is taken to Italy and cut and polished there. Some of it is made into round beads, some into oval beads, some of it is left like tiny branches. The larger pieces are cut into cameos for rings or brooches, and the largest pieces of all are made into ornaments, such as umbrella handles. One very curious ornament is made oftener than any other. It is a coral hand. The Italians and the Spaniards and many other races believe that if they wear this little coral hand it will act as a charm to keep away evil. They say that a coral talisman will ward off what they call 'the evil eye.'

That reminds me of the story of an old lady who lived in London during the air raids. She was talking to an officer home from the front who had seen how a bomb could pass through storey after storey of a building and then blow it sky high. The officer asked her if she were nervous. 'Not in the least!' she replied. 'You see I am quite safe, I have put a tarpaulin awning over my house.'

The coral has as much power to protect any one from evil as that tarpaulin awning had to protect the poor old lady's house from bombs.

But, boys and girls, those who believe in things like coral charms are right in this—we do need something to protect us against evil. We need a talisman very badly on our way through this world. We shall meet evil time and again, and as we grow older we shall have many a grim fight with it. What is going to help us? No coral hand, no lucky black cat, no woolly mascot will aid us in that struggle. There is only one talisman that will be of any use, and that is Christ in the heart. If we wear that talisman no evil can befall us. Christ will help us in every battle against what is wrong.

We have had many messages from the different jewels throughout the year, but no message is more

important than the message of the coral: 'Wear the only true talisman.' If we do that all the virtues that the other jewels spoke of will come easily to us.

The Christian Year.

Third Sunday in Advent.

The Need of Redemption.

'The whole creation groaneth and travaileth . . . waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.'—Ro $8^{22.\ 23}$.

The redemptive character of the Christian religion is our great hope, especially when we compare it with other principles of reconstruction. Therein, in this redemptive character, lies the dynamic energy of Christianity. A redemptive system is a system which postulates, first, that the present condition of things is evil; and, secondly, that this evil is not to be remedied from within, but that a remedy from without is forthcoming.

William James, who certainly was not a Christian, defined the essence of all religion as, first, the sense that something is wrong; and secondly, that this wrong can be put right by making the necessary adjustments with the higher powers. I am not sure that all religion can be got into that formula, but certainly redemptive religion can.[1]

There is a shallow optimism which thinks that the world will come right without redemption. The war has put an end to that optimism. Certain notions once popular have been destroyed by it. The intellectual baggage for life's cabin passage, which a little while ago did duty, has been torpedoed.

1. First and foremost, men have learned the reality of evil. Men used to say that evil was ignorance, or that it was imperfection, or arrested development, or the survival of animal instinct, or even that it was mere illusion, the inevitable error of a limited and partial view, but that from the point of view of God there was no such thing as evil. Now the world has seen it in 'all the naked horror of the truth.' Evil is the chosen idol of a will self-absorbed and worshipping its own fancies. Other errors this age may make and will make. All kinds of different schemes for salvation it may embrace. One thing it will not do: it will not deny that salvation in some form is a need of the world; nor will it assert that evil is an illusion, a tremor of the imagination. The world knows evil and feels it, as it has not for generations. It suspects it for what it is—love turned the wrong way.

2. Secondly, the notion of progress—progress automatic and inevitable—has gone. There is a right sense in which we can talk of human progress: there certainly is. Yet the war with an enemy, more fiendish and brutal and treacherous than the worst days of barbarism, has shown how false is that idea of the last age, that the world gets better of itself, like a child growing in its sleep. Tennyson bade men 'move upward, working out the beast, and let the ape and tiger die.' Such appeals ring false now because the ape and tiger are so far preferable to the 'All Highest,' and still more so to the intellectual apologists of his scheme. For the remarkable thing is, as the French Ambassador pointed out in speaking of *la barbarie pédante*, not a certain amount of barbarous action—presumably that takes place in all war—but the intellectual backing which such actions have had, and the definite command on the part of the highest authorities among the enemy.

3. Thirdly, and closely connected with the last point, even more patently false than the doctrine of natural goodness and inevitable progress, is the doctrine that all necessary amelioration can be effected by culture. Education increases the power of a nation or an individual to manipulate the world. A man knows more and knows better what he wants. He has more command of the means to attain his wants. He has learned the self-control needful to wait and to set aside subsidiary aims; but a man does not, because he is educated, necessarily have nobler aims than others, and he may be more and not less conscienceless. Germany has shown us with less of grace and refinement what Europe in the fifteenth century learned from some of the Renaissance princes and popes.[2]

[1] J. N. Figgis, *Hopes for English Religion.*

Fourth Sunday in Advent.

The Fact of Redemption.

'The whole creation groaneth and travaileth . . . waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.'—Ro $8^{22.\ 23}$.

This is the ground of hope for the Christian religion: the world not only needs but feels the

[2] J. N. Figgis, *Ibid.*

need of redemption; it does not always use the word. But if we are to realize this hope, we must fulfil certain conditions.

1. First of all, this redemptive character of the Christian faith must not be slurred over; to use technical language, the theology of grace must be emphasized, the sense that it is not of him that willeth, or him that runneth, but God from whom comes all help and power—the picture of the gospel as light to a world in darkness, or, more accurately, a spar to a man drowning in a rough sea, and not merely the thought of religion as the guarantee of man's own higher thought, or the sanction of honourable living, or of social piety. It is that, but it is much more than that. What the world needs is help; it feels that it cannot help itself alone, and if it can only believe it is ready to recognize that power from beyond which shall tell us that 'our warfare is accomplished, our sin is pardoned.'

People are afraid sometimes to talk about the forgiveness of sins, but it is what we all want now. In the last age the Atonement was not denied; it was taken for granted. Conversion, definite conversion, very often was denied. Men thought of the Incarnation as the central truth, and that if they concentrated upon that all the rest would follow. Unfortunately, what has followed this thrusting aside of the Atonement has been an increasing hesitation about the worship of Jesus as Lord. Make people think of Jesus as Saviour, and they will soon worship Him as Lord. Make Him only the Lord of all good life, and they will begin to think of Him merely as the embodiment of the moral ideal, and gradually, almost without knowing it, to lose sight of His transcendent nature. It is Jesus as our Saviour who always wins men, and always will do, except the virtuous few, the 'moral gentlemen,' upon whom Dr. Forsyth casts scorn. But what men need is 'that strange Man upon the Cross,' God supreme, not in power, but in humility and suffering and submission. 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me.'

2. Along with the Cross, we must emphasize the unique character of our religion. Sometimes we hear that the war has shown the bankruptcy of the Christian Church. That is nonsense. What it has shown is the bankruptcy of all other ways of life. Ever since the Renaissance people have been excluding Christianity from any influence on public life, or intellectual ideals. Christendom was a fact in the Middle Ages; now it is no more than a geographical expression, if it be so much. The war was provoked by the universal prevalence, in industrial no less than in international relations, of ideals and methods which not even its enemies would call Christian; and so it has proved the death of all hopes for the world based upon pure naturalism.

3. Lastly, the Alexandrian age of English religion has closed—the period dominated by Westcott; that method of assimilation and culture (the same sort of motive that inspired Clement of Alexandria and others of the Greek fathers) has come to an end. It did a very valuable work, but we have passed that stage. The growth of influential systems of thought and inspirers of action which not only deny creeds but repudiate Christian ideals of life has forced upon us the realization of our distinctness, our unique quality as Christians. All high ideals ultimately have their sanction in the Christian Church, and without that support will soon decay; just in the same way as the ancient world on its better side was feeling after a system of life only fulfilled in completeness by the gospel. But we must not take these things as the measure of our aim. In the same way the philosophy of the Cross of Christ was precisely the same as the philosophy that we see now fulfilled so wonderfully in the sacrifice of those who died for us at the Front. But although it is the same, it is a great deal more, and bigger.

Frank paganism is now proclaimed by some; others throw scorn upon every object of Christian reverence, even the character of our Lord. It is clear that we must realize our own unique position; we must present our Faith as desirable because it is different from other things, and not in spite of the fact. Too many people have been inclined to argue that there can be no harm in accepting Christianity, because it is just the same as all high moral ideals. We want its distinct beauty and colour, and that is what the world wants, though some will reject it. To that end we need more and more to feed upon the Bible.

That is the great help for us in England. The Bible is not so well known or read as it used to be, apart from students. The great tradition, the atmosphere of Scripture, is still with the masses. Quotations still are made quite naturally. This is more so, I think, with the great masses of men than it is with the most highly educated. But if we are to bring out these qualities, the redemptive, the apocalyptic, the unique nature of the Catholic religion, we need more and more to dwell upon the words and the pictures of Scripture; not upon any summary of the philosophy of religion or the ideals of Christianity, but the pictures of

Jesus in the Gospels, or that wonderful picture of the heart and mind of that great human being St. Paul, or the sublime, almost unearthly vision of St. John. It is often the best hope for any one who is in doubt about his faith to get him to read the First Epistle of St. John.[1]

Epiphany.

Jesus the Saviour.

'Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.'—Ac 4^{12}.

Truth is exclusive, it denies and shuts out its opposite. The greater the truth, the greater the realm in which it refuses rivalry. So Christ, as Saviour, stands alone; there can be no rivalry in functions so august and supreme. We do not ignore other gracious ministries that are the gift of culture and civilization; there are other voices that tell us much about God; but when it comes to that Fatherhood which is conscious and blessed salvation, Christ stands alone. He is more than all others, above all others. He alone is the way, and to abide in Him is to dwell in God.

Read the story of the sainthood of any age, and it always has this feature—intensity of faith that is narrow and sometimes cruel; it is jealous for its Lord and for its version of His gospel, but at the same time its delight is to serve through sacrifice and hideous suffering and loss that it may heal the sick, save the erring, and rescue the poorest. It is a paradox of history that the narrow faith most often goes with the open heart.

1. It was this exclusiveness of the gospel in which its offence in large part consisted. Even the Jew might have been persuaded to accept Jesus as a Rabbi, teaching a way to God; and the Gentiles in that syncretistic age would have welcomed with acclamation such a teacher among the multitude of their other masters. But neither Jesus nor His followers would accept such an assignment. He and they alike claimed for Him the sole empire over salvation and would brook no fellow by His side.

The teachers of apostolic days never placed Jesus alongside the world's teachers and prophets as though they would claim for Him a place in the shining circle of the world's elect souls. They claimed for Him, not a place, but *the* place. He stood alone. The only fellowship they knew was that which gathered round His feet. This was always their message, distinctive and clear. They confronted an age which believed in bringing all the gods together, and in tolerating them all, and to that temper of mind they said, There is no other name but that of Jesus whereby we must be saved. Search the New Testament from end to end, and you will not find a hint of compromise about the supremacy and uniqueness of Jesus.[2]

2. The modern mind, however, shrinks almost instinctively from the saying, 'There is none other.' We regard it as belonging more to certain exclusive types of religious life than to the main stream of Christian opinion. It is heard from the lips of preachers who make the gospel an aggressive attack upon the individual soul, threatening pains and penalties unless it is received. Naturally the truths of the New Testament become remote and unreal when they are associated in our minds with little sections of religious thought and life for which on general grounds we have but little liking.

The age in which we live has toleration for one of its watchwords. Men no longer cast us to the lions when we proclaim Jesus the only Saviour the world can know, His name the only name under heaven given among men wherein they must be saved. But the world of to-day endures with no more real patience than that older world two thousand years ago the arrogance of such lofty claims. This is, above all others that have preceded it, the day of eager and appreciative study of other faiths; and equally with the others that have preceded it, the day of indifference, if not hostility, to the high claims of Jesus.

There is a circumstance in the movement now going on at Benares which is well worth our notice here. It had been the usual practice of European teachers to ignore all Hindoo philosophy, to tell the natives that they had no science of their own, and then to invite them to begin from the beginning in European method.

There was something very unconciliatory, almost insulting, in thus treating a people who knew how to calculate the stars in ages when our own ancestors were painting themselves blue, and worshipping the oak and the mistletoe in the forest with the most barbarous and inhuman rites. Dr. Ballantyne has, I am told, pursued a very different process. He first went to school to the pundits, and then asked the pundits to come to school to him. He learned all their science, and sounded all their philosophy; and then, taking them up at the point where they could go no further, he opened to them regions beyond, and led them forward to the light of truth.[3]

---

[1] J. N. Figgis, *Hopes for English Religion*.

[2] S. M. Berry, in *Problems of To-morrow, Social, Moral, and Religious*, 135.

[3] *Memorials of the Life and Letters of Major-General Sir Herbert B. Edwardes, K.C.B., K.C.S.I.*, i. 305.

3. In one particular would we emphasize the influence of the present. We are being forced back upon the enormous power for good or evil stored up in every real belief. It was only in a world where belief seemed to be a theoretical thing that men could say, 'It doesn't matter what you believe.' We see differently now, because there are beliefs abroad in the world which are fast making a wilderness of civilization. Ideas are the pathways, sometimes slow and tortuous pathways, to actions.

Sometimes men have taught 'belief in the Name' as a formal thing, as though a man could repeat a word as a sign that his soul is saved. The truth is infinitely larger and greater than that. It violates every instinct of reason to imagine that the real division among men lies between those who take upon themselves the Name of Jesus and those who neglect to do so. The real division lies between those who look to Jesus as the standard of living, as giving to the world the truth about God and about the life and duty of man, and those who accept another standard. We believe that this faith can be both preached and practised without a hint of intolerance. There is a light of God which is given to all men; there is a work of God in all the religions of the world; there is a Providence who does not limit Himself by the bounds of our narrow doctrines. But there is a Christ who is the one Light and Life of men. Every gleam in the world is a reflexion of His light, and only in the Christian revelation of the Word made flesh is there an answer to what the souls of all men are reaching out to attain.

When Sir Joshua Reynolds delivered, many years ago, in the city of London, a series of addresses or lectures on art, he took four statues, known as night, morning, noon, midnight, the four seasons of the day—the middle of the night, the middle of the day, the dawning of the morning and the sunset of the evening. Marvellous statues they are. He took those four statues for a whole course of lectures in London, and when he was through he closed in this manner. He said, 'And now, gentlemen, I have lectured to you during this entire season, and I beg now, in the close of this lecture, to bring before you one name only, the name of Michael Angelo.'[1]

Is the Christ for us the Name above all others? Is there that urgency in our own personal devotion and adoration? Do we bring the fire and passion of that belief into our praise and prayer and service? The great and victorious life is the Christ-filled life. There is no other secret. It is the secret for which the world is waiting and longing. Let us keep it burning in our hearts and at our altars so that we may be ready when the darkness passes from the earth and the dawn of a new day is at hand.[2]

[1] J. K. Maclean, *Dr. Pierson and his Message*, 230.

First Sunday of the Epiphany.

What shall we do?

'Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Brethren, what shall we do? And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him.'—Ac 2^{37-39}.

1. If Peter's sermon is given substantially as he delivered it, we cannot but note the courage with which he, who had declared 'I know not the man,' proclaims that God had made Him 'both Lord and Christ'; and this in the city in which He had so recently been condemned to death as a malefactor. The Jewish rulers had shown no signs of remorse for their action, and the rancour with which they had pursued the Master was likely to be exercised against His followers. Yet there is no shrinking on Peter's part. If all had ended in the Crucifixion, if there had been no Resurrection, his conduct is inexplicable. And again we are struck with his grasp of Biblical truth. We know what Peter had been but seven weeks before. Now he has grasped the Divine purpose in history, and sees that the ages are not unrelated days, but are all one in the scheme of God. The fisherman might know the letter of the Scriptures; but whence came this insight into their spirit? The only possible explanation lies in the fact that between his past and this speech comes the Pentecostal gift.

2. The Jews that listened to the sermon were for the most part sincerely religious. They had come from far-off lands to worship at the temple in Jerusalem, and they loved the Scriptures to which Peter appealed for proofs that Jesus was the Christ. They were deeply impressed. As they listened, the hearts of stone turned to hearts of flesh and were pricked to the quick with the stinging sense of sin. Though many of them cannot have had any direct share in the death of Jesus, yet they felt that what their own people had

[2] S. M. Berry, in *Problems of To-morrow, Social, Moral, and Religious*, 144.

done, and they themselves had approved, was something to be ashamed of. There was a general cry of distress, 'What shall we do?'

Peter was ready with his answer. He called them to repentance and to testimony, to open confession of Jesus Christ by baptism.

The beginning of the spiritual life seems just to consist in a consciousness of complete failure, and that consciousness ever grows deeper. This is well illustrated in Browning's account of Caponsacchi; from the time when Pompilia's smile first 'glowed' upon him, and set him—

> Thinking how my life
> Had shaken under me,—broke short indeed
> And showed the gap 'twixt what is, what should be,—
> And into what abysm the soul may slip.

3. Then comes the gentle and tender word: 'For the promise is unto you and to your children.' How gentle Peter could be. When you heard Him in thunder-tones, saying, 'Repent!' you said, 'Harsh man; austere preacher.' Now, when the people are in a right state of mind, and really want to know what to do, having told them what to do, he breathes upon them the very benediction of God. He says, 'There is a promise for you; there is grace in store for you.' When God spake some of His tenderest words you were in His heart at the time, and your children were there. The promise is yours. Come and take it, and even on earth be almost in heaven!

4. 'Make disciples of all the nations by baptism' are the words of our Lord. 'Be baptized, every one of you, for the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off,' is St. Peter's application of this passage. St. Peter's language admits of various interpretations. Like much of Scripture, the speaker, when uttering these words meant probably one thing, while the words themselves mean something much wider, more catholic and universal. When Peter spake thus he proclaimed the world-wide character of Christianity, just as when he quoted the prophet Joel's language he declared the mission of the Comforter in its most catholic aspect, embracing Gentiles as well as Jews. 'I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.' But St. Peter never thought of the full scope of his words. He meant, doubtless, that the promise of pardon, and acceptance, and citizenship in the heavenly kingdom was to those Jews that were present in Jerusalem, and to their children, and to all of the Jews of the dispersion scattered afar off among the Gentiles.

Thirty Years of New Testament Criticism.

By Professor the Reverend James Moffatt, D.Litt., D.D., Glasgow.

In 1889, when the first volume of The Expository Times appeared, Dr. Westcott had just issued his commentary on Hebrews. Westcott's interests were not in the Old Testament, but he declared that he thought it 'likely that study will be concentrated on the Old Testament in the coming generation.' That anticipation was partly, but only partly, realized. The recent publication of *Lux Mundi* had set afire the controversy over the Higher Criticism which blazed round the Old Testament. Canon Driver's great contribution, in his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, which came out in 1891, accentuated the interest, and had the rare merit of stimulating popular intelligence and at the same time of indicating fresh lines of research. But it was not long before the critical issues were recognized to have a bearing upon the New Testament as well. Dr. Gore's famous essay in *Lux Mundi*, upon 'Inspiration,' made this inevitable by asserting that the words of Jesus could not be taken as foreclosing certain critical views, *e.g.* about the 110th Psalm. Such an admission roused Canon Liddon's dismay and wrath, but it had a more lasting effect. For a time the fascination of Old Testament literary and historical research absorbed most students of the Bible in this country. Then the range of interest widened, it was realized that the Tübingen school had raised real issues, and the New Testament writings became involved. For nearly thirty years they have been the subject of persistent, minute, and

varied study. How has the situation developed? And where has it left us to-day? Such are the questions which I am asked to answer in outline.

The alteration in outlook has been great, greater perhaps than most of us at first realize. To measure it, the simplest way is to recall the successive controversies which have marked the advance of the science of New Testament criticism. Controversy is a good thing in intellectual matters. It educates the public, and it clarifies the mind. It has acquired a bad name in religion and in theology, but controversy need not be quarrelling; it is the examination and investigation of some more or less crucial problem, conducted by different sides of opinion, with the desire of arriving at the exact truth, of clearing away misconceptions, of brushing off prejudices, and of inquiring whether traditional views are adequate to the larger synthesis required by the discovery of fresh facts. 'The dust of controversy,' said Carlyle, 'what is it but the falsehood flying off from all manner of conflicting true forces?' Even when the issue appears absurd, and eventually proves absurd, something is gained. Fresh confirmation flows to the position which has been unintelligently assailed. And often some new set of facts is forced upon the unwilling attention of scholars; they are obliged to take account of details which have been unduly ignored, or of considerations which have emerged since the traditional position was drawn up. At any rate controversy is an end of indolent acquiescence in accepted ideas. And indolence is our worst enemy, even inside what is true and right. There is no progress possible without a readiness to restate certain positions and to re-open some questions. 'It is not error which opposes the advance of truth, it is indolence,' said Turgot, 'obstinacy, the spirit of routine, everything that favours inaction.' Which is as true of theology as of politics.

By the year 1889 it seemed to many, like Dr. Westcott, that the problems of New Testament criticism had been fairly settled. The violent controversy over 'Supernatural Religion' appeared to have gone in favour of Lightfoot. No more was to be said. But appearances were deceitful. The controversy was soon to be raised again, over the whole field of the New Testament literature, raised with such energy on both sides that in looking back from the standpoint of to-day we are astonished at the change that has come over the entire situation. The truth is, factors were emerging in the study of ancient civilization and in historical discipline that were bound to tell upon the study of books like those of the New Testament. 'A classical scholar turned fifty,' says Professor Burnet, 'can barely recognise the studies of his youth, and finds it harder every day to keep up with the advance of knowledge in his department. Excavation, especially in Crete, and the recovery of papyri from the sands of Egypt have not only transformed our outlook upon the Mediterranean civilization, of which ours is the lineal descendant, but have given us the inspiring feeling that some new truth of first-rate importance may come to light any day.' New Testament criticism has shared in this transformation to some extent. The setting of the New Testament literature in its age, against the background and upon the soil of the religious movements surging through the first century in Hellenism and Judaism, is one of the vital gains of the past three decades. Particularly in connexion with Paul's theology and letters, and also with the Johannine literature in Asia Minor. The papyri themselves have not yielded very much in the way of actual literary discoveries, nothing equal in importance, *e.g.*, to the *Didachê*. The rubbish heaps in Egypt have done more for the classical scholar than for us. We can still entertain the hope that a copy of Papias's *Logia* may turn up some day. If it did, it would help to settle several disputed questions. But the main use of the papyri has been in the region of language, and their very character, as unliterary productions for the most part, has given them value. The grammar of the New Testament Greek has had to be re-written. To a small extent, textual criticism has also been affected by them. The Westcott and Hort theory has not been substantially shaken by the newer textual criticism, but there seems to be a tendency to modify it in one or two points. Thus, the so-called Western text would appear to be rather earlier than Hort allowed, and the Egyptian affinities of the Neutral text are stronger than he supposed. Still, such results of the new setting are nothing compared with the broader effect, the focussing of the mind upon the New Testament literature as part and parcel of the religious situation in the first century. Contributions have poured in from classical philologists, students of

comparative religion, and archæologists. The older view that the New Testament represented something apart in language and form has finally disappeared along with the theory of verbal inspiration, and with the abandonment of such false claims to isolation the uniqueness of the collection as a religious phenomenon has become all the more marked.

One result of all this has been an awakening sense of the relations between the primitive Christian tradition and Hellenistic religion, especially as regards the mysteries, the religious philosophy of the age, and the ethical movements, which powerfully affected the popular mind. But this Hellenistic atmosphere was impregnated with Orientalism, and a corresponding interest has been stirred in the relations between the early Church and Judaism. Originally this broke out in the study of Paul's religious affinities. How far was he indebted to the Greeks? How far to his rabbinic training? But the discussion soon passed over into the investigation of the Gospels, and it has left us to-day with one of the most pressing problems in our subject. The revival of interest in rabbinic Judaism during the first and second centuries was one by-product of the older preoccupation with apocalyptic literature. Both lines of study have contributed to a fuller appreciation of the teaching of Jesus in form and spirit. The apocalyptic background has been studied with extraordinary care. Probably we have exhausted that field, so far as it offers materials for the understanding of the Gospels. Unless more materials are discovered, I doubt if any valuable gains are to be expected in that quarter. It is in the field of rabbinic learning that there is more likelihood of progress, especially now that Jewish scholars themselves are at last alive to the need of making the materials more accessible and of giving some help in evaluating their contents. The danger of uncritical extremes is, of course, upon us. The exaggerated importance assigned by some to the apocalyptic movement, as if that completely accounted for Jewish piety in the days of Jesus and Paul, has been succeeded by an equally uncritical significance attached to Midrashic and early rabbinic traditions. But we shall arrive before long at a proper appreciation of the true conflicting forces in the controversy. It is a gain, at any rate, to have the issues sharply stated, and the student to-day is in a far better position than he has ever been for handling the early tractates in reliable editions.

It was in the region of apocalyptic studies that the first of the great controversies of our period was roused; I mean, the discussion over the 'Son of Man' title. How far did that represent the idea applied to Jesus in the Gospels, and how far, if at all, did He apply it to Himself? And why did Paul avoid it? This controversy blew past without yielding very satisfactory results, when one considers the amount of time and paper spent upon it. Was it a Messianic title? Did it involve the associations suggested by Daniel and Enoch? Such questions were asked, but they could not be answered adequately till the problem was lifted into a wider range.

This came with the Eschatological controversy, which was really begun by the publication, in 1900, of Johannes Weiss's *Predigt Jesu* (second edition). Weiss was the one theological genius of last generation in German New Testament theology, and the impulse he gave to this particular question was in the right direction. Once the extremists had stated their case on both sides, the re-adjustment became possible. It was recognized that there was a shortening of the time-view on the part not only of the primitive Church but of Jesus Himself. The bearing of this upon the conception of what Jesus intended and taught was first appreciated, and the statement is still being worked out. In spite of Loisy, the purpose of Jesus is now generally admitted to have been quite devoid of political propaganda; in fact, its anti-zealot character is fairly obvious. In spite of writers like Father Tyrrell, it is equally impossible to believe that Jesus regarded Himself as the mysterious Son of Man, the superhuman being who was to come down from the clouds and with shattering forces inaugurate a celestial revolution. These extravagances have proved as untenable as the moral valuation which was content to hold that the apocalyptic material in the Gospels is a troublesome, accidental element, and that the moral doctrine is the one thing needful. The long controversy is beginning to restore the true proportions of the eschatology in the historical teaching of Jesus. We must recognize evidently that Jesus did anticipate an immediate coming of the Kingdom in some sense, and endeavour to face what that admission involves for the significance of His teaching and the development of the

early Church. As regards the former, the issue is: What is required to explain the consciousness of Jesus as the Divine Son, if neither rabbinic piety nor apocalyptic ecstasy accounts for it? As regards the latter, the problem is: Did Paul give the real start to early Christianity in its theological adventures? How far does the primitive Church require to be considered, in understanding, for example, the early significance of the eschatology or of a title like 'Lord'? Was it Paul who detached the early Church from Judaism and gave it a career in the larger Greek sphere by translating the original eschatological gospel into something which was capable of meeting the demands of the outside world?

Such problems were being dimly felt, and the outcome was the 'Paul and Jesus' controversy, which went on, partly as an effect of the eschatological conflict, partly in independence of it. Was Paul independent of Jesus? Or was he acquainted with His main teaching? By this time the older van Manen hypothesis that Paul had never existed, and that his Epistles were later fabrications, had disappeared fortunately from serious criticism. Even its belated re-appearance in the pages of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* did no harm—except to that excellent work. The historicity of Paul and the authenticity of most of his Epistles were now axiomatic. But the more clearly this was recognized. the more sharp seemed the differences between the apostle and Jesus, the more difficult it appeared to give an intelligible account of the rise of Paulinism on the basis of the Synoptic teaching. No controversy during our period has been so fruitful. And the problem is still with us, in spite of the admirable contributions to it in whole or part. Nine years ago Schweitzer could assert that 'present-day criticism is far from having explained how Paulinism and Greek theology have arisen out of the teaching of Jesus.' The explanation has not yet been fully given. Probably the best hope of advance lies in a broadening of the issue, and in a closer appreciation of the middle factor, the religious consciousness of the primitive Church, for which, unfortunately, our literary documents are so scanty.

The 'Paul and Jesus' controversy made it almost inevitable that the question should be raised, Did Jesus ever exist? Can the theology of Paul be reconciled with the existence of such a Jesus as the Synoptic Gospels portray? The controversy came. It still can be heard in stray quarters of amateur criticism, by writers who make play with the myth-forming faculty, which is supposed to have created Jesus as it created Osiris and Dionysus. One good it did, and that was to call out some excellent statements of the historical evidence, and to discredit the reckless methods employed by the sceptical school. Otherwise the theory is as dead for serious work as the Baconian theory about Shakespeare. It was a cloud, and it passed.

What all this discussion has brought out may be described thus. (*a*) It illustrates the danger as well as the need of using methods of comparative religion in dealing with the New Testament. This is obvious in the hasty attempts to identify Paulinism with a Christianized version of the mystery-religions, or to treat the Gospels as Father Tyrrell did, as if Jesus really attached much more importance to sacraments than to morality, or to discover the root of Christianity not in the historical Jesus but in some Christ-idea. Abuses like these are, like measles, almost inevitable in the youth of a new method. But they ought not to discredit the method itself. (*b*) Again, the basis of Christianity, as disclosed by the New Testament, lies in the historical Jesus, not in Paul or any other. So much is clear. Yet, if Paul, as Wellhausen declared, 'was really the man who best understood the Master and carried on His work,' how are we to understand that Master, putting His own words beside the interpretation of the Pauline theology? Was Paul at any rate the founder of Christian theology, as distinct from Christian religion? Or was there something in the message of Jesus which was a real germ for the redemptive interpretation of Paulinism? No thoughtful student of the New Testament can say that the last word has been spoken on this subject. Some false tracks have been explored and abandoned. Some hints of the true direction have been given. But we may anticipate advances in the immediate future.

I have barely referred to the literary criticism. Here the prospects are narrower, because so much attention has been given to the critical forms of the literature that less remains to be done. The Two Document hypothesis of the Synoptic Gospels is fairly sea-worthy. It has stood several storms, and weathered them. The problem of the Fourth Gospel has reached the stage when, with almost

unanimous consent, scholars are agreed that recourse must be had to some theory of its composite origin, and less unanimously that its tradition or one of its sources may be connected with the Apostle John. The only Epistles of Paul which are still disputed, as regards authorship, are the Pastorals and Ephesians, and the literary problems of the others are of minor interest. It is not easy to anticipate very much fresh work along these lines. The one book which is evidently going to excite fresh discussion is Acts. Here the problem of Semitic sources awaits discussion in the light of linguistic research, just as in the case of the Apocalypse.

If I had to sketch the probable direction of New Testament criticism during the next period, indicating its needs and prospects, I should sum up the position thus. The past thirty years have brought us to a point at which the following matters require fresh treatment. (*a*) The precise nature of pseudonymity in literary matters, during the first century. (*b*) The presence of non-primitive elements in the New Testament itself; I mean, the question of tendencies in Matthew which point to a theological interpretation of Jesus and to a recognition of what were afterwards called 'counsels of perfection' in the ethical teaching, the question of powers assigned to apostles in Acts and in the Pastorals, the question of 'sacramental' tendencies in the Fourth Gospel and even in Paulinism, and so forth. The New Testament includes several elements of this kind. It is inadequate to blur them over, and as inadequate to assume cheerfully that they were a necessary part of the evolution of the primitive Christian gospel, the assimilation of an organic spirit working on its environment. (*c*) The economic factors in primitive Christianity, as hinted at by the New Testament, need a fuller treatment than they have received. This partly follows from (*b*), since there is little doubt that Luke, for example, has over-stressed the sayings of Jesus about riches and poverty. (*d*) A new edition of Wettstein is required, or something to take the place of his rare edition. It would be an onerous work, requiring co-operation, but it is wanted. (*e*) With commentaries we are well supplied, for the most part, but a critical edition of the Fourth Gospel in English would be a boon and a blessing, if it were equipped like Lagrange's *Mark* or J. Weiss' *1 Corinthians*. (*f*) We are also without any satisfactory work, in English, on John the Baptist; there is ample room for a critical monograph on his revival movement in connexion with Judaism and with early Christianity. (*g*) Probably the newer psychology, with its training in the methods of valuing psychic phenomena, will prove of use in the historical appreciation of data like the miraculous narratives and the phenomena of visions; along this line, delicate but central, much work waits to be done.

These suggestions do not profess to be at all exhaustive. I merely put down one or two that occur to me at the moment as being urgent. In any department, especially in textual criticism and in theology, New Testament study can be enriched by contributions even upon themes which have been written about endlessly. But one thing ought to be laid on the conscience of all who care for the New Testament, and that is the duty of fostering the study of Greek in the next generation. Modern educational reforms are making this more and more difficult, in schools and even in colleges. It is far less easy to-day to secure a knowledge of the Greek language than it was thirty years ago, in those who are the hope of theology. How the interest in classical studies is to be revived remains a problem, but it is certain that unless efforts are made by competent authorities there will be fewer and fewer students in our theological colleges who are qualified to appreciate the New Testament at first hand, much less to carry forward its interpretation. Perhaps one way of inducing the younger generation to take up Greek seriously, not simply Hellenistic Greek but classical Greek (after which Hellenistic Greek is not grievous), would be to show what the New Testament and classical Greek have in common. For example, Greek literature at its best and the New Testament on every page both deal frankly with life; they are in different ways healthy antidotes to any weak sentimentalism. The New Testament is often preached in a tone that suggests the very opposite; some sayings of Jesus are isolated, the idea of Christian love is evaporated of moral content, and—largely due to Renan—the primitive Church is represented in a mood of provincialism and pathos, like an old woman bending over a jar to inhale the fragrance of withered roses. Nothing is more remote from the truth. The sentimentalizing spirit, a bad effect of the wholesome movement which we call

Romanticism, is totally out of keeping with the New Testament, and also—this is the point I wish to make—with Greek literature. Neither has anything for the dilettante or for the pedant, though the dilettante and the pedant have frequently tried to lay hands on both. As Mr. Livingstone puts it, in his acute book on *The Greek Genius*, 'there are two literatures in the world which are at war with this spirit; they are very different in their conclusions, for they start from widely different presuppositions, but they are very much alike in their determination to see things as they are. One of these is Greek literature, the other is the New Testament. Both to the early Christians and to the Greeks life was too real a thing to be surrendered to sentiment and sham.' Greek literature resisted the temptation to unreality which sprang out of the artistic temperament; the New Testament resisted the religious temptation to unreality, and the one is as subtle as the other in its tendency to seek consolation in unreal fancies, to pose, to be affected either in disclaiming or in expressing moral passion. The severe criticism to which the New Testament has been subjected during the past thirty years has made it impossible to regard this collection of books as a mosaic of texts to be fitted into proofs of dogmas. But it has also done away with the notion that the New Testament is the book of a timid, conventional little society which shrank from contact with the facts of life and sheltered itself behind pretty fancies about God and the world. It was not written for such persons, nor by such persons. Its writers are not self-conscious artists, and its audience is not a handful of dainty, sentimental spirits, who hesitate to face living issues. There is no pathos in the New Testament, in the sense of a weak, regretful, affected attitude to life. The pathetic thing about the New Testament is the way in which it has sometimes been perverted into a book for people whom the apostles would have found it difficult to recognize as alive at all. Whatever the next thirty years bring, in the shape of critical methods and results, one is safe to predict that they will more and more leave honest students with the impression that this is a literature which is never tired, and therefore never eccentric or affected. You may grow old as you work at it, but in this little collection of Greek books you discover what classical students find in Greek literature, not simply the satisfaction of dealing with the sources, which is always freshening to the mind, but a spirit of youthfulness, a moral reality, a vitality, a directness, a refusal to evade great issues, which more than repays any trouble spent upon the language.

Entre Nous.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

Self-respect.

1. 'I RECENTLY listened to two distinguished scholars who occupy important chairs in the University of Berlin. One appeared in rusty garments and soiled linen, while he droned away in a lifeless fashion for nearly an hour. The sight roused in me an instinctive resentment. I felt that his appearance was an insult to his hearers, and that it betokened a want of self-respect, however far these things may have been present to his conscious thought. They ought to have been present to him. There is an everlasting incongruity between great learning and dirty collars. The other man held an equally high rank in scholarship, but he was dressed in faultless taste. His neck was clean, his linen was immaculate. His beard was closely cropped and carefully brushed, his coat was closely buttoned. He was "a gentleman and a scholar." There was nothing foppish about him; he was simply a clean, wholesome man who had a keen perception of the fitness of things. It was a pleasure to look at him, and he spoke as he looked, with freedom, exactness, and fiery animation.'

The story is told by Dr. A. J. F. Behrends, one of the Yale Lecturers on Preaching. Notice the words 'it betokened a want of self-respect.' But has the ambassador to think of himself? Is 'self-respect' a word proper to one who beseeches men *in Christ's stead*? The Bishop of Durham thinks it quite proper, and who has a finer sense of ambassadorship than he? By 'self-respect' he

dares to translate the Greek word αἰδώς. That word occurs only once in the New Testament; for the best text throws it out of He 12^{28}, where it is rendered in the A.V. by 'reverence.' The single occurrence is 1 Ti 2^{9}, in reference to the adornment of women: 'shamefacedness' being the A.V. translation (R.V. 'shamefastness').

Dr. Moule speaks of it as 'that noble pre-Christian ethical term which lay ready and waiting to be glorified by the Gospel.' How so, if it is used in the New Testament but once? It is used but once because it falls within that greater word which means reverence toward God. It is no longer, as in classical Greek, a word standing by itself and expressing an attitude that is simply human and self-regarding. In the New Testament self-respect is the attitude of the man or woman who has been bought with a price and now belongs to another. And the very rarity of its use is a sign of the completeness of the change wrought by the new relationship. If one is still to be encouraged to have self-respect, the encouragement is to something very much finer than the old pagan virtue, however homely the encouragement may be.

Dr. Moule's is as homely as Dr. Behrends'. 'Let the man be seen by those who are about him, and who in one way or another wait on him, to be *quite simple while quite refined* in ways and habits; to be active and wholesome in the hours he keeps; to hold self-indulgence under a strong bridle (shall I say, not least the self-indulgence which cannot do without the stimulant and without *the pipe*?); and he will be in a fair way to commend his message indoors. Let him be seen, without the least affectation, but unmistakably, to find his main interests, within doors as well as without, in his Lord and His cause and work; to be the avowed Christian at all hours; and he will be doing hourly work for Christ.'

2. But the ambassador for Christ may go further. Paul exhorted Timothy to suffer no man to despise him, and Dr. Behrends in another place of his book on *The Philosophy of Preaching*, says he exhorted him to maintain his self-respect. And he makes the modern application: 'The advice has not become obsolete. It was never needed more than now. There is no place where decay and loss of power so surely and swiftly follow upon moral timidity, or that want of intellectual poise which a noble self-respect ensures, as the pulpit. The preacher, as the herald of God, should be the humblest of men; but that humility should inspire him with an unusual and sustained boldness when he speaks to his fellows, under the profound conviction that what he has to say the whole world, from prince to beggar, needs to hear and heed.'

This is the form of self-respect, we think, which the Roman Centurion had and which he expressed in the words, 'I also am a man under authority.' It was just because he was under authority that he could issue his orders and be obeyed. He himself had no authority; the orders were the Emperor's. Jesus greatly commended the Centurion for his words. They recognized in Him authority also, and just the authority which He claimed. He was sent. He carried the mandate of the Father. 'The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself: but the Father abiding in me doeth his works.' And just as He was sent by the Father, so are we sent by Him. Therefore our self-respect when we see that no man despises us is not a 'self-regarding virtue,' it is Christ-regarding and imperial.

SOME TOPICS.

Patriotism.

The Rev. Dr. Carter has written down some of his experiences with the men to whom he ministered in hospital. *The Gospel to War-Broken Men* is the pathetic title of the book (R.T.S.; 1s. net). This is one of his recollections: 'A lad of the Black Watch held my hand in a final good-bye. "God bless you," he said, "I'll think of you over there." "It is God's own kingdom," I replied. "I know," he said, "but oh, sir, *I wish I could have gone to it round by Scotland.*"'

Paradise scientific.

This is from the new edition of *The Coming Polity*, of which the authors are Mr. Victor Branford and Professor Patrick Geddes:

'There is an old and venerable Babylonian tradition, transmitted by Israel to the west, that man had once long ago a home and a garden given him to care for, which were the masterpiece of the divine Geotect, and to which all since planned are but what their kindred garden suburbs are to Paradise. The story tells how he and his wife lost home and situation together, and merely through yielding to what are our common modern desires, of things fair to the eye and sweet to the taste, with luxuries of "intellect and culture," as well. The story is thus plainly

and psychologically true. Its lesson is that the adjustment of our life and surroundings must be not merely geotechnic, much less merely neotechnic. It must also be spiritual; assuredly not merely intellectual: on that point the story is clear. Its emotional element must be not only large and impulsive, but also sincere, and therefore ring true in action.'

Clothed upon.

Dr. Kelman has some moving incidents to describe in his Yale Lectures. This is one: 'A young officer of my acquaintance was killed in France. Three days later his sister dreamed that she saw him sitting in a mess-room with his fellow-officers evidently in the highest of spirits. "Why, Dick," she said to him, "I thought you were dead." "Dead!" he shouted, tossing back his head with a hearty laugh. "No, we're not dead; we're only waiting for new uniforms."'

Helping.

The Comtesse de Franqueville, whose biography is noticed among the literature, had much experience in helping. She says:

'There are three lessons experience gives as to helping others; and the more your neighbours differ from yourself in their circumstances and ways, the more need there is to study and follow these rules—

'"I. You *must* know your neighbours' *tastes* as well as sorrows, sins and wants. There is as much difference among individuals and classes as there is among nations. One man's meat is another man's poison, and *vice versa*. This is true in every possible application.

'"II. You *must* respect their liberty and rights. Be patient under rebuffs, and blame yourself for stupidity or want of tact; it is a safe presumption.

'"III. You *must* keep your eye on Christ and the individual. Numbers stun and confuse. Keep your eye on Christ and a man—*not millions*. Take the food from Him and give it, and it will, though you may not see it, feed a multitude."'

Special Providences.

For the fundamental things of apologetic go to a scholarly Unitarian. For an exposition of the doctrine of God, for a defence of the theistic against the materialistic interpretation of the Universe, go to the Rev. Sydney Herbert Mellone, M.A., D.Sc. His *God and the World* (Lindsey Press; 2s. net) is most effective. Dr. Mellone has the calm courage of the scholar; he has the sure touch of the literary artist. And he is not content with generalities. Is he discussing the doctrine of Providence? he discusses also the belief in 'special providences.' And he accepts them. He says:

'There are those who believe that they can point to such events in their lives, though they were full of trouble or tragedy. In sorrow and suffering there is "a deeper voice across the storm"; a voice, still and small, yet stronger than the tumult of our grief, saying, "It is I—be not afraid." I will mention two expressions of this, which have reached me. One says: "This [the feeling of God's sustaining presence] only came to me after great trouble—very depths of trouble; and the realization of God which it brought seemed to make all the trouble worth while. But I cannot put it properly into words, and I do not like to try." Another: "My experience tells me that it is in and after sorrow of the most hopeless sort—as in the death of one we love—that God's relation to us is felt to be at once personal and fuller, richer and more comforting than any human personal relations can be." Many could bear witness to this, if they were willing or able to speak.'

The Venture for Sunshine.

The Rev. W. Y. Fullerton calls his new book *God's High Way* (Morgan & Scott), and also a book of 'old ideals and new impulses.' Of the 'old ideals' we may perhaps discover an example in the sermon on the words, 'Many are called, but few chosen,' where he tells us that 'the thought is not that some are accepted and that some are rejected, but that amongst those that are accepted only a few achieve renown. It is the idea of choiceness rather than of chosenness that underlies the words.' And of the 'new impulses' we may perhaps find a case at the end of the volume where he describes his first ascent of the Sparrenhorn in July 1881:

'On this first visit when I had barely begun to climb I was met by those who had started earlier. They had not got half-way and were coming back because the mists had descended and it was useless to go farther. They passed, and, reluctant to give

up my quest, I waited, sitting on the hillside under the mist.

'Two things came to remembrance. Below, I could yet see the smoke from the only house on the plateau apart from the hotel and the Swiss chalêts. It was the cottage of Professor Tyndall, who, in my native city, as President of the British Association, had made his challenge on prayer, when I was then in my teens. I thought of that, and then I recalled the covenanting story of Peden the prophet, how when he was pursued by his enemies he cried to God to cast the lap of His cloak over him, and the mist came down on the Scotch hillside, and hid him from his foes.

'Then, quite simply, I accepted the challenge of the unbeliever and of the believer, and asked God, Who has all power over the works of His own hand, graciously to lift the mist; and I went on. It was foolhardy if you please, presumptuous perhaps, and what happened may of course be described as coincidence. But there is always something more in the depths of the soul's experience that is not satisfied with such criticisms or explanations. There came a rift in the mist; I got to the top in safety, and in brilliant sunshine gazed on the wonderful panorama of peaks and glaciers. After ten minutes' ecstasy, prudence urged me to descend. The mist descended more quickly, but I got back in peace, the only one who happened that day to have the advantage of the sunshine.'

Professor Sayce.

Mr. J. T. Hackett, in *My Commonplace Book* (Fisher Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), gives a good reason for the existence of anthologies. 'The Blanco White sonnet,' he says, 'I could find *nowhere* except in collections of sonnets, which in my opinion are little read. It will be observed that in anthologies alone can Blanco White's one and only poem be kept alive.' He might have added other examples. He might have told us that we should have difficulty in finding Professor Sayce's poetry without anthologies. We might not have known that he was a poet. Mr. Hackett himself recovers for us two delightful satires from the old *Academy*, one on Haeckel's manner of finding 'matter, matter everywhere,' the other on Renan's way of finding Renan everywhere.

Mr. Hackett, however, refuses to call his book an anthology. It is simply a collection of the good things which he came upon in his reading. Well, it is itself good reading, not to be read continuously, but to be taken up at odd moments and enjoyed. And Mr. Hackett's own notes are sometimes as good as the good things he has discovered. After telling us where he found the two poems by Professor Sayce which he quotes, he proceeds to tell us something of their author.

'Anything about Professor Sayce must be interesting to the reader, and I, therefore, need not apologize for mentioning the following incidents, which, I imagine, are known only among his friends. In 1870, during the Franco-German War, Mr. Sayce was ordered to be shot at Nantes as a German spy, and only escaped "by the skin of his teeth." It was just before Gambetta had flown in his balloon out of Paris, and there was no recognized government in the country. Nantes was full of fugitives, and bands of Uhlans were in the neighbourhood. Mr. Sayce was arrested when walking round the old citadel examining its walls —not realizing that it was occupied by French troops. Fortunately some ladies of the garrison came in during his examination to see the interesting young prisoner, and, after Mr. Sayce had been placed against the wall and a soldier told off to shoot him, they prevailed upon the Commandant to give him a second examination, which ended in his acquittal.

'Mr. Sayce was also among the Carlists in the Carlist War of 1873, and was present at some of the so-called battles, which, he says, were dangerous only to the onlookers. He also once had a pitched battle with Bedouins in Syria.

'Professor Sayce (he became Professor in 1876) has also the proud distinction of being the only person known to have survived the bite of the Egyptian cerastes asp, which is supposed to have killed Cleopatra. He accidentally trod on the reptile in the desert some three or four miles north of Assouan and was bitten in the leg. Luckily he happened to be just outside the dahabieh in which he was travelling with three Oxford friends, one of them the late Master of Balliol. The cook had a small pair of red-hot tongs, with which he had been preparing lunch, and Professor Sayce was able to burn the bitten leg down to the bone within two minutes after the accident, thus saving his life at the expense of a few weeks' lameness.'

NEW POETRY.

Cale Young Rice.

In the year 1906 Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton issued in this country a handsome volume (paper you gloat over) by a young American poet named Cale Young Rice. Its title was *Plays and Lyrics.* In his own land Mr. Rice is greatly appreciated: did the volume 'catch on' here? Perhaps it did, for now the same publishers have issued the same poet's works complete to date in two bulky but beautiful volumes. The title is *Collected Plays and Poems* (12s. net).

Of the Plays, which occupy much of the space, what can be said? What can be said of any man's plays these three hundred years? It seems so easy to write plays. Did not Wordsworth say that even he could have written plays, plays like Shakespeare's, if he had had the mind? It proves so difficult. If these plays were set beside other modern plays, they would, we believe, show up all right. And possibly they can be acted with effect. But—well, we hurry on to the Poems.

What a gift of rhyme and of rhythm Mr. Rice has. Listen to this:

When the wind is low, and the sea is soft,
  And the far heat-lightning plays
On the rim of the West where dark clouds nest
  On a darker bank of haze;
When I lean o'er the rail with you that I love
  And gaze to my heart's content;
I know that the heavens are there above—
  But you are my firmament.

When the phosphor-stars are thrown from the bow
  And the watch climbs up the shroud;
When the dim mast dips as the vessel slips
  Thro' the foam that seethes aloud;
I know that the years of our life are few,
  And fain as a bird to flee,
That time is as brief as a drop of dew—
  But you are Eternity.

You see there is no lack of technique. What he sees he can make others see, and even give great pleasure in doing it. What is wanting, then? If anything is wanting, it is the great purpose. It is the sense of a high calling. It is the joy of discovery in the deep things of God. Mr. Rice is not irreligious, nor is he indifferent. But he is not carried away by the vision and the glory.

Yet again, he comes near it. Here are two of the shortest of the poems:

A Song for Healing.

(On the South Seas.)

When I return to the world again,
  The world of fret and fight,
To grapple with godless things and men,
  And battle, wrong or right,
I will remember this—the sea,
  And the white stars hanging high,
    And the vessel's bow
    Where calmly now
  I gaze to the boundless sky.

When I am deaf with the din of strife,
  And blind amid despair,
When I am choked with the dust of life
  And long for free soul-air,
I will recall this sound—the sea's
  And the wide horizon's hope,
    And the wind that blows
    And the phosphor snows
  That fall as the cleft waves ope.

When I am beaten—when I fall
  On the bed of black defeat,
When I have hungered, and in gall
  Have got but shame to eat,
I will remember this—the sea,
  And its tide as soft as sleep,
    And the clear night sky
    That heals for aye
  All who will trust its Deep.

The Striver.

When I struggle, with human hands,
  The hands of God betray me.
When I cry, 'I will win or die!'
  His silences dismay me.
Yet, when a victim, low I lie,
  His victor-wreaths array me.

For I have held but one defeat
  Final and faith-abjuring;
Held—when strife at its worst was rife—
  But *this* thing past the curing:
Failure to see how surely life
  Grows great with great enduring.

William Watson.

Sir William Watson's new volume, *The Superhuman Antagonists* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), derives its name from the poem which occupies fully half its pages. For the machinery of that poem the author has gone to Persian mythology. Its topic is the ancient (and to some men and women still so awful) problem of the existence of

evil in the world. 'I have borrowed from that mythology its fundamental idea: the idea of a world ruled by two mutually hostile beings, Ormazd and Ahriman, the Good and the Evil Spirit: and I have brought into my story, with sufficient modification of their native attributes, three of the many divinities or demigods who in the Zend-Avesta are pictured as revolving about the central figure of Ormazd, the all-beneficent. That is the full account of my obligation.'

The metre is Homeric, not in the length of line or beat of syllable, but in its effect on the English ear. Thus:

Reverberant, vibrant, nor less broad and deep
Than the sea's utterance round the cloven steep,
Was his rich-billowing voice, each cadence grave
Being like the lapse of a sonorous wave
When it withdraws down a resounding shore.
And after his last word, there hovered o'er
That council a brief silence, tremulous
As with expectancy, till Rashnu thus
Put it to flight.

Of the shorter poems we take the liberty of quoting one. Its title is

BEHOLD!

O Thou that with a signal canst control
All seas that roll;
O Thou that with a whisper canst assuage
All winds that rage:
Behold how softer than the human breast
The wild bird's nest!
Behold how calmer than the world of men
The wild beast's den!

Joyce Kilmer.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton are the publishers in this country of the prose and poetry of *Joyce Kilmer*, edited, with a Memoir, by Robert Cortes Holliday (2 vols., 12s. net). The prose volume contains essays, letters, and 'miscellaneous pieces'—chiefly two dramatic sketches, called 'Try a Tin To-day' and 'Some Mischief Still.' The essays are on 'Holy Ireland,' 'The Gentle Art of Christmas Giving,' 'A Bouquet for Jenny,' 'The Inefficient Library,' 'The Poetry of Hilaire Belloc,' and 'The Catholic Poets of Belgium.'

Mr. Kilmer was of Irish descent and a fervent Roman Catholic. He had his discipline. 'Dear Father Daly' (this is one of the letters)—'I do not like to burden my friends with my troubles, but you have certain opportunities that I lack, so I am asking you the greatest favour. Please pray for the healing of my little daughter Rose. She is dangerously ill with infantile paralysis. This is a disease that has appeared among mankind only recently, and physicians are uncertain how to treat it. She is staying in New York with her mother to be near the doctor, and I am staying here nights to take care of my other child. Of course the maid is here during the day, so the house is kept up. But Rose cannot move her legs or arms—she was so active and happy only last week—she cannot even cry—her voice is just a little whimper—the danger is of its reaching her lungs and killing her. I cannot write any more. You know how I feel. Pray for her.'

The memoir is written with much enthusiasm. This is of one aspect of the essays: 'If Colonel Roosevelt had never done anything other than what he has done in writing, he would undoubtedly be highly esteemed as an American man of letters. And people have made very creditable reputation, as humorists who never wrote anything like as humorous essays as those of Joyce Kilmer. They fairly reek with the joy of life. They explode with intellectual robustness. They are fragrant in fancy, richly erudite in substance, touch-and-go in manner, poetic in feeling, rocking with mirth, and display an extraordinary *flair* for style.'

But we like the poetry most. Let us quote two short poems:

THANKSGIVING.

The roar of the world is in my ears.
Thank God for the roar of the world!
Thank God for the mighty tide of fears
Against me always hurled.

Thank God for the bitter and ceaseless strife,
And the sting of His chastening rod!
Thank God for the stress and the pain of life,
And oh, thank God for God!

KINGS.

The Kings of the earth are men of might,
And cities are burned for their delight,
And the skies rain death in the silent night,
And the hills belch death all day!

But the King of Heaven, Who made them all,
Is fair and gentle, and very small;
He lies in the straw, by the oxen's stall—
Let them think of Him to-day!

R. C. Trevelyan.

This short poem on Clouds is a good example of Mr. Trevelyan's thought and manner:

I sit upon the hill and watch the great clouds
drifting by.
Each of them takes a form and gesture as
though it were a living thing,
With a life nobler and more gigantic than ours.
Their shapes change, imperceptibly flowing from
form to form,

With each form a new mood,
With each mood a new remorseful envy.
Their passion and grandeur make me ashamed
of Man's littleness.
I long to forget it for ever,
And share in that life of measureless form and
energy.
But alas, there is no road thither.

It is not a robust faith; it is not a cheerful optimism. Is it not our duty as well as our pleasure to be of a cheerful countenance and to trust? The title is *The Death of Man* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net).

Arthur Waley.

Mr. Arthur Waley has published *More Translations from the Chinese* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. net). There is also in the book a translation of some prose tales—very well worth reading for their own intrinsic interest. The poetry is simple and primitive.

Since I lay ill, how long has passed?
Almost a hundred heavy-hanging days.
The maids have learnt to gather my medicine-
herbs;
The dog no longer barks when the doctor
comes.
The jars in my cellar are plastered deep with
mould;
My singers' carpets are half crumbled to dust.
How can I bear, when the Earth renews her
light,
To watch from a pillow the beauty of Spring
unfold?

Helen and Bernard Bosanquet.

Zoar: A Book of Verse, by Helen and Bernard Bosanquet—that is the title (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net). Bernard Bosanquet's portion is translation from Goethe. Take this from 'Hermann and Dorothea,' as example:

The gifts we longed and prayed for
The great gods send them down,
They send perhaps a martyrdom
When we desired a crown;

But though our wishes painted them
In fraudulent disguise,
The gifts we longed and prayed for
Are here before our eyes.

The original poems are by Helen Bosanquet. There is in them all a sense of ministry as well as of poetry. The words quoted above the following sonnet are 'Mediums are said to be doing a good business':

'Have we not earned our rest?' Oh, hear them
plead
Whom Death has drawn across the dividing line.

You should have kept their memory as a
shrine,
A holy place, where he who runs might read
The lovely record of a noble deed;
Nor sought, with restless craving for a sign,
By vulgar aid to break the peace divine
Which gathers round the kingdom of the freed.

Were there indeed no barrier that could save
Their spirits from the importunity
Which looks to necromancy for a proof
The dead will talk with us, nor hold aloof,
Far better were the silence of the grave
Than life entangled in futility.

Walter Wingate.

Poems, by Walter Wingate (Gowans & Gray; 3s. 6d. net), are some in English and some in Scots. One of each dialect could be quoted with effect, but the tongue that is most natural to the poet shall have the preference:

THE EVENING SERVICE.

The win' was lowsed as the sun gaed hame,
It roared in the vennel, it rived at the roof;
And the bell in the steeple swang, swang,
Cryin' the folk to come.
The bell in the steeple swang, swang,
But the folk grew fain o' their ain fireside,
When the blirts o' the rain played skite on the
pane,
And the win' played wow in the lum.

Intil the kirk it was lown and quate,
An elder here and an auld wife there;
Wi' a dizzen or twa in the backmaist raw,
And a lassock to sing in the choir.
A lassock or two that were blate and mim,
In a kirk sae big, and cauld and toom;
The openin' psaum maist dee'd in a dwaum,
Pluft oot like an ill-blawn fire.

And I thocht as I sat and countit them a',
Wi' my breeks wat through at the knee—
'When the Shepherd comes here His sheep to
ca',
Will *thae* be a' He will see?'

A. Kirchberger.

Day-Springs is 'a Book of Verse and Prose' by A. Kirchberger (Bell & Sons). Half the book is occupied with a Play—a Play of Nature and God and Love and Little Children, very charming. The prose consists of short essays on Heather, the

Sphinx and the Mona Lisa, the Sleeping Lake, and the Memory of a Vision—every essay well-chosen words married to wholesome thoughts. The verse is true poetry—all the little that there is of it. Once it is a poem of intimacy with the God of love and rest; and once it is perplexity:

Do you remember how they fell,
Great God—in the whistling, blinding hell
Of fury? Nay, but I will pray
You did not see.

And now they speak of victory,
I'm glad—but when they shout
I think of how we shouted as the knife went in,
And then somehow—forgive me—but I doubt
Of God—and bloodshed and unspoken sin
Seems quite the simplest thing.
I don't think I could sing
Of Victory, just yet.

No matter! They do it well
The men of many words,
Writers and politicians, they who sell
Our lives; the little singing birds,
And the paroquet—the press.

I've seen men, dying, bless
God for their death—
I've heard them with slow-drawn breath
In agony curse him for life,
And with them I have blest and cursed
Until belief and unbelief are nursed
Alike in me—and God is fled,
Perchance to gather up the dead
From the ocean and the land.

The enemy is beaten—I am glad. And yet—
I watched him die, and saw the life squeezed out
Of eyes and throat—you understand
—As yet—as yet I cannot shout.

Edward Wyndham Tennant.

'We all loved him, and his loss is terrible. Please accept my deepest sympathy. His Company was holding a sap occupied by Germans and ourselves, a block separated the two. Bim was sniping when he was killed absolutely instantaneously by a German sniper. His body is buried in a cemetery near Guillemont. The grave is close to that of Raymond Asquith, and we are placing a Cross upon it and railing it round to-day. Forgive this scribble, we are still in action, and attack again to-morrow morning. Bim was such a gallant boy.'

That was the word sent by Lt.-Col. Seymour of the 4th Batt. Grenadier Guards to Lady Pamela Glenconner announcing the death of her eldest son. Lady Glenconner has written his biography. *Edward William Tennant: A Memoir*—that is the title (John Lane; 21s. net).

It is a surprise of biography, and it is a surprise of boyhood. Lady Glenconner has kept back nothing; everything is of love and courage and truth, from earliest childhood till that day Col. Seymour writes of. 'When things were at their worst he would pass up and down the trench cheering the men, and it was a treat to see his face always smiling. *When danger was greatest his smile was loveliest.*' That is from a private soldier. 'To say why we loved him is difficult; it was chiefly because he was so absolutely himself, and how lovable that self was is difficult to express. His actions were entirely unselfconscious, and often beautiful. Bim always went straight to the heart of things, and people.' That is from the letter of a friend.

His love for his mother was wonderful. We know the poem he wrote about her when he was a mere child (it has already been quoted in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES). From school when eleven he wrote: 'Some one said here to-day that they had seen something in a magazine about your being the loveliest lady in England. I felt jubilant indeed! Then some one told me they had heard it said that Daddy was one of the best shots in England, that made me feel happy too. Then somebody—I suppose in fun—asked me if you went in for the "Throne" beauty prizes. That made me laugh. To think of the silly women who do go in for them, when if you appeared they would say, "Here cometh one the latchet of whose shoe we are unworthy to unloose." I am very proud of you, darling Mummie.'

His poems are included in this volume. We shall be content to quote one of the shortest:

A finer heritage than house and lands
Is mine: for on the canvas hanging there
More love is centred and instilled more care
Than in broad acres. He who understands
What deep-laid passions ebbed through brush and hands
Of these brocaded masters, long since dead
(Their souls are with us yet, tho' life has fled),
Let him who feels the magic of their wands
Thank God afresh, and let him sit and gaze,
Trying to stir within his troubled mind
The splendour of those oft-depicted days.
With what romance is every portrait lined!
Each sweeping stroke a softly-flowing phrase,
That word by word its story doth unwind.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is some complaint that the Christian pulpit is too reticent on the conditions of the life to come. The spiritualist ranges the country and reports the doings of the 'discarnate' in detail. And the people love to have it so.

The people do not all love to have it so. We quote from a daily newspaper: 'As for myself I must say that Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's address left me precisely where I was before. The elaborate picture of "the other side" would be more convincing if it were less detailed. Can a "message" in such words (I quote from memory) as "My word, Matilda, but this is grand!" really form a foundation for a theory of the universe?'

The criticism is both sound and central. The details which are so freely furnished are puerile enough, but their puerility is not the worst of it. The question to ask is this, Does the fact of death, so tremendous for science, mean so little for philosophy? Can you really explain it by explaining it away? If the conditions 'on the other side' are so little altered that commonplace people continue their commonplace talk and their commonplace conduct, what a gasping fraud has been the government of the world from the beginning. We have been induced to believe, not by Scripture only, that 'after death cometh judgement,' and it has been the moral steadying of mankind. What judgement is that which leaves us drinking beer and smoking cigarettes and engaging in such conversation as a schoolboy here would declare to be 'drivel'?

Where wert thou, brother, these four days?
There lives no record of reply,
Which, telling what it is to die,
Had surely added praise to praise.

Surely, if it can be told. But can it be told? Dr. Marcus Dods thought Lazarus had nothing to tell. Dr. J. D. JONES thinks he had things too great for telling. They were unutterable, he says, because of their very glory. But they left their mark on Lazarus.

'He was the same Lazarus, and yet he was different. His experience had totally changed his outlook. From this time forth he measured all earthly things by eternal standards.'

For Browning is a better guide than Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. 'Browning, in that Epistle of an Arab physician, tries to imagine the change wrought in Lazarus by his brief sojourn in the spiritual realm. He pictures him as if living henceforth a sort of dazed life, as if his soul was elsewhere; as if his eye, dazzled with the glories beyond, could not adjust itself to the things of earth.

"Heaven opened to a soul while yet on earth,
Earth forced on a soul's use while seeing heaven;
The man is witless of the size, the sum,
The value in proportion of all things,
Or whether it be little or be much."'

Dr. JONES has published a volume on Lazarus. That is to say, he has published a volume in which is expounded, verse by verse, the story of the Raising of Lazarus from the dead. It is such a volume of pure exposition as we have been told we should never again see. Its title is *The Lord of Life and Death* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net).

How does Dr. JONES understand those words in the narrative of the Raising of Lazarus which have been found so puzzling to expositors—that Jesus 'groaned in the spirit, and was troubled' (Jn 11^{38})? He does not pass them by. He passes nothing by that is perplexing. The miracle itself receives his most respectful modern attention. He takes nothing out of it which he has already put in. These words present a real difficulty to him.

Elsewhere, he shows, the word translated 'groaned' occurs three times. Twice it is rendered 'strictly (*i.e.* sternly) charged,' once 'murmured.' Jesus 'strictly charged' first a blind man and then a leprous man not to make known abroad their healing. They 'murmured' against Mary for the waste of the alabaster box of ointment. How can 'He groaned in the spirit' be turned into 'He sternly or indignantly charged the spirit'? or how can it be rendered 'He murmured against the spirit'?

First of all, there is no word for our English 'in': the Greek is the simple dative of the word for 'spirit.' The literal translation is, 'Jesus then, when he saw her wailing, and the Jews who came with her wailing, sternly charged the spirit and troubled himself.' Dr. Moffatt's translation is, 'He chafed in spirit and was disquieted.'

Next, notice that the word occurs again in a subsequent verse (11^{38}) and a slightly altered construction: 'Jesus then, again groaning in himself, comes to the tomb.' How can the word be rendered 'sternly charged' or 'murmured' there? Dr. Moffatt again uses 'chafe': 'This made Jesus chafe afresh, so he went to the tomb.' And it may be difficult to find a better word for both the occurrences. But why did Jesus chafe?

Notice the occasions. The first occasion was the wailing of Mary and the Jews. The other occasion was the saying of 'some of them': 'Could not he who opened the eyes of the blind man have caused that this man should not die?' Now, when we take the two occasions together, we see that the usual interpretation is quite impossible. The usual interpretation is, in the words of Dr. Dods in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, that 'His sympathy with the weeping [not weeping but wailing] sister and the wailing crowd caused this deep emotion.' Dr. JONES sees that that will not do. It may fit the first occurrence of the word, but certainly not the second, and it leaves the word itself with no distinctive meaning.

Dr. JONES thinks that 'our Lord was moved to indignation at the sight of the triumph of evil and death; that He saw in the tragic sorrow before Him the result of the Devil's handiwork, which had brought sin into the world and death through sin, and He was indignant at the havoc wrought by him; He was indignant that the destiny of man should be so blighted, and that God's purposes for him should be so perverted. Our Lord was angry that death should be here at all, He was angry that death should be able to claim His friend, He was angry that death should be able to fill the world with lamentation and woe. He was angry with the sin, and the personal spirit of evil, which had brought about this tragedy.'

It is an interesting idea. But is it true? And is it an interpretation? Did our Lord, when He was on earth, really look upon physical death in

this way? Does this interpretation really make the difficult words intelligible?

Jesus heard the wailing of Mary and the Jews. But if death, the death of the body, was so offensive to Him, He did not need that to remind Him of the offence of it. He heard some of them express surprise that He had allowed Lazarus to die. He deliberately allowed Lazarus to die: 'When therefore he heard that he was sick, he abode at that time [even then] in the place where he was two days.' Is it likely that He would have lost those two days if death had been to Him so dreadful? Is it likely that the taunt of the bystanders would have so strangely affected Him?

Where does Dr. JONES find evidence that Jesus looked on death as so great an evil? The evidence is all the other way. There is a form of death which He thought evil and never wearied warning men to escape it. But it was not the death of the body. The death of the body He made comparatively light of. 'Fear not them,' He said, 'that kill the body and have no more that they can do.' And if ever He found people weeping and wailing because some one had died, or if ever He heard people suggesting that His purpose on earth was to keep the body alive—that was to Him occasion enough for chafing in spirit and showing His indignation.

Does such an interpretation deprive us of Christ's sympathy with the sisters? It makes His sympathy more manifest and more moving. For do we not read a little later that 'Jesus wept'? By the ordinary translation we mix up the wailing of the Jews with the weeping of Jesus. The words are different. And by the ordinary interpretation we mix up the expression of our Lord's indignation with the expression of His sorrow. He was indignant at the blindness of the people in making everything of the death of the body; He was indignant even with Mary; but He silently shed tears of sympathy with the sisters as He followed them to the grave.

One thing more. The Jews and Mary were wailing. It was not insincere sorrow, but it was loud and bitter. Jesus wept. It was the expression, says Godet, of a calm and gentle sorrow. But once Jesus also wailed. 'When he beheld the city, he wailed over it.' Says Dr. JONES, and this time truly, 'It was a vehement emotion He displayed on that occasion. He sobbed aloud over Jerusalem. But He only "shed tears" at the grave of Lazarus. Now, I think there is a point to be noticed here. What made Him sob and wail over Jerusalem was its obduracy and its sin. What brought the tears to His eyes at Bethany was His sympathy with Mary. From which I gather this, that sorrow and loss are not half so terrible in the eyes of Christ as sin. His eyes fill with tears in sympathy with the sufferer, but He "wails" over the sinner.'

In the book entitled *Words in Pain* which is noticed among the literature of the month, some bitter things are said about the fear of God. 'Can it be satisfactory to a wise God to see His children do good for Heaven's sake, and refrain from a bad act because they are afraid of God's punishment? They fear God, but do they really love Him? If a child wants to steal sugar, I would rather see him take it than not do so out of cowardice (fear of the Lord). The God you find so necessary must be everywhere and always there like a watchful policeman, and the child (later on, man) cannot be trusted a second to be left without that guardian.'

The writer of the letters which are contained in that amazing book is as keenly opposed to the love as to the fear of God. 'With so many people hungering for love,' she says, 'why give so great a part up to Deity? Acknowledge, Doctor, if you had not had your good share of human love, a mother's, a wife's, and your children's, you would not so well understand the other. A child, I think, is taught untruthfulness when you make him say that he loves God.' That, however, is indi-

vidual, even eccentric. Dislike to the idea of the fear of God is widespread.

In his new volume of sermons, *The Theology of Jesus* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), Dr. W. E. ORCHARD has a sermon on the fear of God. He begins with the sentence: 'Nobody fears God nowadays.' It is a quoted sentence. From whom does he quote it? From anybody. From everybody. 'Nobody fears God nowadays'—it is the concomitant to Sir Oliver Lodge's lighthearted remark that nobody nowadays worries about his sins.

The sentence, if it means anything, must mean one of two things. Either it means that there is no God to fear, or it means that there is nothing to fear in God. Dr. ORCHARD passes from the first meaning. It is no characteristic of our time to deny the existence of God. He gives himself to the second meaning. And he asks, Why did men ever fear God?

His answer is, Because they did not understand Him. 'God was unknown; His character was concealed from mortal eyes, the working of His mind was not comprehended; the principles by which He governed the world or judged mankind were inscrutable. And because men did not know God, they were afraid of Him.'

Was that all? No; more than that, men feared God because they did understand Him. They feared Him because they understood that He was holy and because they knew that they themselves were sinful. 'In God Himself there might be nothing to be feared, but in man's approach to Him there was, and nothing could overcome it.'

Then came Christ. Did Christ show God less holy? 'Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name.' Did He show men less sinful? 'If I had not done among them the works that none other man did, they had not had sin; but now have they no cloke for their sin.' Did He show that holiness was after all not of the essence of God, or sin a mere accident in man? Take the Pauline words: 'For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.' And from that moment the fear of God, the ancient fear of approach to a holy sin-hating God, disappeared from the consciousness of every believer in Christ. So to say of Christians now, to say of them at any time since Christ died, that 'they fear God,' is to misrepresent Christianity.

Yet Christians do fear God; they fear God still. Does that mean merely that they reverence God? It means more than that. 'Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell'—there is that fear still.

'It looks like the old fear back again; the fear of hell, the criminal's fear of punishment, the coward's fear of the consequences. In the effort to escape from this, some have thought that Jesus was referring to the devil and not to God. But we need not take that desperate course to escape the difficulty; for surely there is a fear of consequences which is quite wholesome and natural. We know now that hell is not an arbitrary consequence of sin, but sin itself; and it does mean utter misery for the soul, the destruction, perhaps, of the highest thing in us. It may be cowardly to fear the *suffering* of hell; but what this looks like is a commendation to fear the hell where one has no capacity to suffer.'

And Christians have another fear. 'The finally remaining fear is perhaps the tenderest and most sanctifying thing that we can ever feel. It is not to fear the justice and the truth of God, but to fear His forgiveness and His beauty. How shall I bear to learn how full and free His forgiveness is, and what it has cost? What joy to know His wounds have healed me, but what shall I suffer when I see those wounds? There will be gratitude which will

need song to express; but will it not also need penitential tears? And when we think of His beauty, the beauty of His love! We take love in this world so cheaply because we are selfish, and because we rarely meet a love that goes far beyond our own. But to see God and to know that He loves us! It is possible sometimes to feel the beauty of the world too much, to feel the springtime as a piercing pain, to faint at the fair beauty of earth, and to be overwhelmed by the glorious majesty of sea and mountain and sky. One may need to have very sensitive appreciation for that. But if one has become sensitive to God, sometimes one is bound to have a last lingering fear that the sight of God will be more than the soul can bear.'

We have heard how it stands with Religion in the Army. How is it with the workers at home?

Few questions are causing us more anxiety. For, even if we do not look forward to a labour government in the immediate future, we know that those who have hitherto been the ruled are henceforth to be the rulers. And even our material prosperity will depend upon their attitude to Religion.

We have an opportunity of answering the question. Last September an International Conference on Labour and Religion was held in Browning Hall at the invitation of the Warden, Mr. F. Herbert Stead. It was attended by delegates from many of the European countries and from India. With one exception, they were working men. They ranged in respect of Religion from the active agnosticism of a Belgian socialist to the local gospel of a Primitive Methodist. A full report of their speeches was taken, and has now been published at the Holborn Press, under the title of *The Religion in the Labour Movement* (3s. 6d. net).

The first fact that comes clearly up from the multitude of words is the need of Religion. The need is admitted even by the active agnostic, though he means his own kind of religion. For the most part it is admitted ungrudgingly, even joyfully. 'We shall have to abandon the notion,' says the Secretary to the National Council of Brotherhoods, 'that religion is a special reserve or perquisite of ecclesiastical organisations, or that it is something which can either go up or down according as communities frown at it or favour it. It is something that never would have been in humanity if humanity could have managed without it.' The delegate from the Socialists in Finland says: 'The Finnish people is by nature a meditative and religious people. It cannot live without religion.'

And it is as clearly shown that Religion is necessary to the Labour Movement. Alderman Sheppard only touches the fringe of the matter when he says, 'Whether in England or in any other country, the Labour Movement will only live in proportion to the men of insight, truth and justice associated with the Movement.' But Mr. F. Chandler, J.P., late General Secretary of the Joiners' Union, is quite explicit: 'Everything in Labour depends upon religion.' So is Mr. George A. Spencer, M.P.: 'Labour divorced from religion and morality is destined to destruction.' The same report comes from abroad. From Denmark comes Mr. C. Norlev, saying, 'When we hold this Conference and discuss the subject of the Labour Movement and Religion, it is because we are convinced that Religion is necessary for the success of the Labour Movement.' And the delegate from Finland, Mr. Sigfrid Sirenius: 'If any cause has to gain success among the Finns, it must be, so to speak, part of the Finns' religion. Such was the case, for instance, with the women's movement, and it succeeded. Such was the case with the temperance movement, too, and we have now prohibition laws in force. I am glad to say that our working people are heart and soul supporters of the prohibition law. Similarly, Socialism itself came to our country with the gleam of a new religion in it, and so it gained its immense influence over the minds of the people.'

With that directness which is characteristic of every speaker at the Conference, we are told what is the enemy of Religion. It is Materialism. One of the speakers, a parson (to use the word used here), misunderstood what is meant by materialism. He took it to mean philosophical materialism, and proceeded to argue against it, quoting Sir Oliver Lodge and Mr. Lecky. But the next speaker put him right: 'As to the naturalistic view of human nature held by Huxley and the Rationalists, there is very little mention of it among the working classes now. I know something of the miners and railwaymen and shipbuilders. There is very little of it amongst them.' No. The materialism with which Religion has to contend among the miners and railwaymen and shipbuilders is quite practical. It is described by one of the speakers as an undue regard for bread and butter.

'It has become the fashion,' says Mr. E. C. Fairchild, 'among the leaders in the Labour Movement, now rather to speak of the materialism of the people who want sufficient coal in winter to keep them warm, or who, because their wages are very low, resent the increase in the price of bread. The materialism of the workers is a request for the common things requisite to keep body and soul together, and it is not an illegitimate materialism; I would suggest that the leaders of the Labour Movement generally draw higher salaries than those whom they lead.' An illegitimate materialism is denied: 'The working classes,' says Mr. George Lansbury, 'are no more materialistic than any other class, and in very many ways are less materialistic than other classes.'

But the danger is sometimes admitted. Mr. Thomas Cape, M.P., admits it. 'I believe there is a peril from materialism as regards the workers. And my belief is borne out by the evidence I have received.' It is even stated once to be on the increase. It is Mr. Stead himself who says: 'It is because the working classes have been the idealistic classes of the world that we would with all our might protest against the invasion of materialism into the regions where ideals have hitherto prevailed. Alas! I have had many testimonies given me, not by employers of labour only, but by Labour leaders who have fought a long fight for the elevation of their class, who have borne the heat and the burden of the day. They have told me in tones of deep sorrow that they find amongst the younger workers of to-day a very different spirit from what prevailed when they set out to fight for better conditions. They say that they find amongst the younger workers of to-day a greed of gain utterly irrespective of the welfare even of their own class, still less of the welfare of the community; that there is a profiteering spirit abroad amongst the workers of to-day that they had never known in the earlier time. They have told me that the workers of to-day are too largely influenced by the desire to get as much as they can and to give as little as they can, and the tragedy of it is that they regard that as happiness!'

It is this very danger that Mr. Stead desires to meet. It was in order that means might be devised for meeting it that he called the Conference. And, with all their differences, not one person present had any other suggestion to make to that end than an outspoken profession of Religion. But what did they mean by Religion?

Senator Vinck from Belgium meant morality: 'I dare to say that in our country it will not succeed if it is not purely a morally educational movement, leaving it to the freedom of everyone to find the origin of those transcendental moral rules.' Bishop Gore meant the acceptance of the doctrine of the Trinity. Between those two were ranged all the rest in uncountable variety.

One part of Bishop Gore's programme was accepted by everybody. All agreed (except the agnostic) to acknowledge the Fatherhood of God. And to that all added—they were for the most part very eager to add—the Brotherhood of Man. Dr. Gore's second proposition, the Lordship of Christ, was not mentioned again till the very end of the

Conference. Then one daring delegate said: 'If I have understood the deliberations of the Conference aright, I may say the unanimous desire has been to rally together in different countries, in different creeds and different movements, all men and women who believe in the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, and, may I not add? the Mastership of Jesus.' The third proposal of the Bishop was not referred to by any one.

That is highly significant. For it is surely the most important proposal of all. How can any movement call itself Christian—and if it does not call itself Christian, what is the use of calling itself religious?—how can any movement call itself Christian if it does not recognize the spirit of the living Christ? 'If you had asked any of those early Christians what it meant to be a Christian, I fancy you would have got one of two answers, either that it meant the belief that Jesus is Lord, or that it meant the belief in the arrival of His Spirit. Very well, then. There is a very widespread feeling, very much wider than the limits of our religious bodies and organisations, that the Spirit of God, the Spirit which is in Jesus Christ, has not deserted or left the world, and that the very purpose for which the Church was formed was that, inspired by His Spirit, it might carry out His Word, and work for the Kingdom of God. That is the third proposition that I seem to feel implicit in the Labour Movement, the belief in an organising, guiding, enriching Spirit which is the Spirit of Jesus. It is the Spirit of God moving and working in the hearts of men.' And Dr. Gore was never more right than when he made that proposition.

But there was something else that many of the speakers insisted upon having included in the Religion of Labour. It was Service and Sacrifice. Alderman Sheppard declared that both service and sacrifice are to be found in the very rules and regulations of the Trade Unions. And he gave examples. 'Can anyone who has the slightest knowledge of Labour forget what happened at the birth of the Dockers' Union? A demand was put forward for improved conditions of service around your docks; an appeal was sent out to the established Trade Unions. The appeal was not made in vain. Assistance, financial and otherwise, came from all of the old Unions, and large sums of money were sent by the Unions of Australia.'

These, then, are the articles of the Labour Creed—the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, the Mastership of Jesus Christ, Service and Sacrifice. Is that all? That is all that was agreed upon. One speaker would gladly have added Worship. He said, 'My friend, Mr. Sheppard of Bristol, was speaking on Tuesday morning with regard to the amount of anonymous unselfish activity of Trade Unions. I felt how true his statement was. At the same time I felt how much more powerful it might be if it were encouraged and nurtured by some deliberate form of worship.' But there was no response.

For Worship suggested the Church. And unanimous as the speakers were that Labour must be religious, they were nearly as unanimous in saying that it should have nothing to do with the Church. When we consider who these men and women were, and what they were assembled to do, that is the most marvellous and the most melancholy fact of the Convention.

What were their reasons? Their reasons were various. One found the Church—and with them the Church meant all the Churches—too sectarian. 'I was brought up in Oxford,' says Mr. Britten, 'a choir boy when I was nine years old, so I know something of the Church. It is with the Church I must deal. The Church is divided against itself: and in that I include all religious denominations. In this sense there is no brotherhood to-day. Look at the Church of England clergymen. They preach different doctrines in high and low churches: and there is no common agreement with the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Churches: neither is there any common agreement with the

Church of England or the Roman Catholic and the Nonconformist Churches. I saw a case in point the other day, of a clergyman in the Church of England refusing his pulpit to a Nonconformist minister. I, as a man, left the Church of England when I began to see the wide class distinction in the Church.'

Another found it too stand-offish. 'Might I venture to suggest, therefore, that if the clergy of all denominations in this country are really keen on getting hold of the men, they should continue to do what so many of them have so ably done during the War—go to where the men are and not wait for the men to go to them?'

But for the most the offence of the Church was that it is 'against Labour.' That belief is evidently as deep-rooted as it is widespread. One speaker may stand for all. Says Alderman Banton: 'I have been a member of the Labour Party since its formation, and I have realised from the beginning the jealousy and the fear in the Labour Movement as a whole, against the encroachment of the ancient forms of ecclesiasticism. They have looked upon the Churches as being organised against them rather than for them. I even think we might say they have believed that the Churches were entirely against them.'

Yet there is hope. If these representatives of the Labour Movement were nearly unanimous in their dislike of the Church, they were wholly unanimous in their appreciation of Jesus Christ. 'Back to Christ' is their phrase—back from the Church and back from everything.

Perhaps they appreciate Jesus because He does not belong to the Church: 'The Church itself, as it is now organised, is not the true representative of Christ on earth. So we have to re-interpret and put into modern language and phraseology our conception of the Divine truths which He expounded.'

Perhaps they appreciate Him because He was Himself a working man: 'Mr. Westrope spoke about the Christ coming from the carpenter's bench. Yes, and the Christ I pin my faith to sprang certainly from the same class as I have sprung from—from the working-class.'

But they appreciate Him. They never mention His name without reverence. They say that if ever in any gathering of Labour His name is mentioned it is received with approval and applause. 'We know that in England' [this is Bishop Gore] 'the name of Jesus Christ is a name hardly ever received without enthusiasm in the Labour Movement. (Applause.) Very well.' 'I have addressed' [this is Mr. Eastman of Hull] 'thousands of my fellow-workers up and down the country, and the mention of the name of Lansbury and Lloyd-George and Smillie and Thomas has caused dissension and discussion, but the Name of Jesus has united them together.' And this is Mr. F. A. Jarman, speaking about the farm-labourers of Somerset: 'You know the condition these poor men live under, on 10s., 11s., or 12s. a week. When I have told them they were going to get a rise they have cheered; but I have told them that is not the first and the last of Trade Unionism. If so, I should leave it to-morrow. When I have told them it stands for something bigger than that, and spoken to them of the things Jesus taught, I think I have got the biggest cheer—a bigger cheer than when I told them they were going to get 5s. a week more—and they wanted it, God knows!'

The New Attitude to God.

By the Reverend W. B. Selbie, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.

One of the most common complaints against theology is that it is remote from reality. Men look upon it as a thing of the schools, a collection of doctrines and formulas that are to be accepted rather than understood, and that have no sort of relation to the world of actual things around them. And the mistake—for mistake of the most tragic kind it is—is not without justification. There are dead theologies enough, but even these are monuments of what was once alive. The history of religious thought is strewn with such memorials, yet they should serve to remind the inquirer of the living faith which they once enshrined. As a matter of simple fact, theology is, of all forms of human speculation, the most sensitive to environment. The changes in man's idea of God, and in the forms in which he has expressed it, have been brought about, not by wanton exercise of the imagination, but by the impact of circumstances. They have been necessitated by that relation between idea and actuality, the very existence of which is often so lightly denied. The process may be traced, for example, in the development of the idea of God in Israel, a development which is quite unintelligible unless we reckon with the influence of the varying fortunes of the people on their conception of Jehovah and His relation to them. True, it needed prophets and psalmists to put the thing into words, and drive it home on the national consciousness. But their work was rendered possible only by events such as the Assyrian invasion and the Babylonian captivity. The same process may be seen at work in the early Church, as witness the Apocalypse and the Pauline letters, and in great restatements of Christian theology, such as took place at Nicæa and in the course of the Protestant Reformation. The common feature in all such cases is the demand for a new interpretation of God and His ways, forced on men by their experiences, and called forth to meet an actual need. That the restatements thus evoked should in time lose their relevance and become stereotyped goes without saying. When they are regarded as final and definitive, and are imposed on men's minds as the last word on the subject, they become a grievous burden and hindrance to the truth. Some men, no doubt, love to have it so, and are content to enclose themselves in a hard shell of dogma and tradition. Their motto in intellectual as in other things is 'safety first.' On the other hand, there are always to be found men of another stamp, prophets and pioneers, who believe that 'where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty,' and that God has not ceased to reveal Himself to men. These are ready to follow the truth wherever it may lead them. Such men have their opportunity in great crises of the world's history. So at a time like the present, when everything is in the melting-pot, there is a felt need for a frank restatement of theology, and for a candid attempt to Christianize the idea of God.

It is often remarked that the war has only accentuated tendencies of thought and action which were already making themselves felt. This is certainly true in the sphere of religion and theology. There the experiences of the last five years have revealed the need for a new theology, and for a re-reading of the idea of God in terms of the life, work, and Person of Jesus Christ. These requirements, however, are not new, though they have been greatly emphasized. For some time past men have been thinking along these lines, and it will probably appear that the effect of the war has been simply to crystallize a good deal that was already held in solution.

The Christian idea of God, then, has generally contained at least three elements: (1) A conception of God as Personal Providence, the creator and sustainer of the Universe, derived from Jewish sources; (2) a Greek element regarding God as the Absolute, the home of all relations and the underlying unity of things; (3) the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. How to reconcile and relate these varied elements has been the problem of speculative theology, and the results have naturally differed according to the stress laid on one or other of them. The issue for the average man has been a rather bare kind of theism, without either warmth or life, and singularly devoid of any distinctively Christian traits. It has broken down under stress of the war, and there is now a genuine demand for something more real and vital. The

difficulty is popularly expressed in the dilemma—If God is omnipotent He is not good, and if He is good He cannot be omnipotent. It is not surprising that a solution should have been found acceptable to many in the idea of a struggling, suffering Deity, entangled in His own Universe, and working through it towards a 'best that is yet to be.' Unsatisfactory as this is, it yet contains certain Christian elements, and constitutes a challenge to Christian theology for an ampler and truer restatement of the doctrine of God.

The demand for such restatement is generally accompanied by a confession of scepticism regarding metaphysical theories or proofs of the being of God. The classical objection to these is on the ground that they do not arise out of, or find any place in, Christian experience. Their value, such as it is, is for philosophy rather than for religion. Something warmer, more real and more vital, is needed than a metaphysical theory. This position is reasonable enough up to a point. By all means let us begin with the idea of God given in Christian history and experience. But we have still to ask whether the idea will work, and that involves the attempt to justify it on philosophical and other grounds. The pragmatic test can never be sufficient by itself, and value is not a substitute for truth. It would help matters if modern theology were less shy of the idea of revelation than it has sometimes been in the past. Our datum then is, 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.' It is admitted that in Jesus we have a unique consciousness of God, derived ultimately from His own experience, though expressed in terms familiar to the men of His day. He filled the name 'Father' with a new content, and, in the light of it, restated God's relations to the world and to men in terms of the kingdom of heaven. If we judge of His teaching by the spirit of the whole rather than by the letter of any individual sayings, we see that this conception of God involves personality, power, and love or grace. If it be of the pith of the Christian revelation to assert that God is Love, then love is only possible to a person, and love without power to further its aims were a meaningless mockery. God is thus known in His relations to the Universe and to mankind, and He must be so known first before we can form any conclusions as to what He is in Himself. For this reason it was that Jesus taught men to begin with faith as the best avenue to knowledge. He would not have us know God by some process of reason first in order that we may serve Him. He tells us that we must be willing to do His will in order to know. We are not asked for any logically compelling proofs of God and His ways. The appeal is rather to faith in the interests of a religious experience satisfying not merely to the intellect but to the whole man. We are dealing here with a conception of the universe which is dynamic rather than static, and with a religion whose finality consists in 'nothing else than in its endless capacity of growth and self-renewal.' It is exactly this that the modern mind is groping after—a God who is not simply and sufficiently expressed in abstract terms as the Absolute, and therefore out of all intelligible relation with the Universe, but one who, Himself personal and living, can come into touch with persons who find their complete life only in Him.

It is, then, on the basis of this personal relationship of God with His creatures that Christian theology must be built up. That complete trust in the Heavenly Father's goodness and utter devotion to His will which was characteristic of the religion of Jesus Himself becomes the norm for His followers, and the experimental ground of their interpretation of God. There is nothing more arid in the older theologies than the discussion of the Divine attributes. This was due to the fact that the subject never escaped from the region of the abstract and the philosophical. Had it started always from the New Testament, and continued on the lines there laid down, the result would have been very different. God's love, for example, can never be regarded as mere emotion. It is active and living, the regulative principle and moving impulse in all His works. It inspires His creation of man as a free being, capable of rising to great heights in response to its appeal, but capable also of depths of sin and infamy in response to lower appeals. But to love it were always a greater thing to create man so than to produce a puppet incapable of freedom and always under rule. From this follows the conception of the world as the arena of man's spiritual struggle, and the means by which he is exercised unto perfection. This love, too, is one that 'will not let go.' God's purpose for man is one of redemption. It is not His will that one of His little ones should perish. So He hath never left Himself without witness, and in the fulness of the times He sent His son into the world that the world

through Him might be saved. 'God commendeth his love towards us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.' The coming of Jesus Christ was no mere accident, but part of the age-long purpose of God towards His creatures. It is the Father's good pleasure to give men the Kingdom, to establish His rule among them in love, joy, and peace. Towards this end the whole of organized Christianity works, and it will be judged by the measure of its success in attaining it.

The work of Jesus Christ completes and emphasizes His teaching concerning God. By His life and death is determined the character of the redemption which He came into the world to mediate to man. As of old He still convinces the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come. Therefore, Christian theology has to reckon with His relation to God on the one hand, and to man on the other. It is not enough to set Him forth as the supreme example for men, or to declare that He has for them the religious value of God. It is in Him that men know God, and in communion with Him they become partakers of the Divine nature. On this whole subject there is much confusion of thought even among Christians, due to the prevalence of the tendency to draw sharp ethical distinctions between God and Jesus Christ. It is here that the demand for a Christianized theology becomes insistent. Only as we know God in Christ can we interpret aright His nature and His intentions towards mankind. The revelation in Christ does not mark, as it were, a change in the Divine policy. It is the fulfilment of an age-long purpose, and is consistent with a Divine nature hitherto but dimly and partially apprehended. But in these terms, again, the Christian faith is dynamic rather than static; not a fixed quantity or a final word so much as a process into which men enter by degrees, and the end of which is not yet. Therefore our apprehension of God in Christ is, and must be, conditioned by our mental outlook and experiences. Christianity is an historical creed rather than a philosophical system, and as such is the more readily adaptable to the varying needs of men.

At the same time men cannot escape from the necessity laid upon them by their own natures to give some reasoned account of the nature and work of the God so revealed in Jesus Christ. Granted that the appeal of the revelation is to the whole nature of man, is made good in experience, and responded to by obedience and faith, this does not absolve us from the duty of thinking things through and thinking them together. The long mental and spiritual struggles which culminated in the great creeds of Christendom accomplished this for the ancient world, and have set up certain clear sign-posts for the men of to-day. But, as we have already seen, the work was carried out always under conditions provided by the mentality of each several age, and needs to be continually restated. The modern mind may not be interested in orthodox Trinitarian doctrine, but is quite capable of recognizing the dangers of the popular tritheism to which this generally descends. It recognizes that a metaphysical Trinity is not given in Christian experience. It seeks for a God who is one, personal, living, loving, and active. Such a God is not to be found in some wholly transcendent being, whose unity spells isolation and importance. Therefore there is still room for a conception of Deity within whose unity relations are possible, and who may be described in social rather than individual terms. Modern investigations into the nature of personality make this at least a tenable hypothesis. If God's relations to the universe take the forms indicated by the terms Father, Son, and Spirit, then there is something in the nature of God corresponding to these. Christian experience cannot be satisfied with anything less than this. It demands a conception of God sufficiently rich and full to account for the great salvation mediated to the world through His Son Jesus Christ.

Modern Christianity, therefore, can never be content with a doctrine of God that insists on the acceptance of ancient formulas as they stand, or is content simply to restate them in more intelligible terms. It recognizes that there can be no finality in theology; and seeks a conception of God big enough to meet the ever-growing needs of human experience and knowledge. Men are beginning to realize that 'God has put eternity into their hearts,' and that it is only *sub specie eternitatis* that they can attain that knowledge of Him which is life. The call for a more real expression of religion in life which has become so insistent of recent years, has its counterpart in the demand for a living God who does things, and whose power is available for the least of His creatures. Once their religious needs have been awakened men will never again acquiesce in the notion that God is the sole possession of any ecclesiastical institution, or that He can be approached only through duly appointed

human intermediaries. Almost without knowing it they believe that the grace of God is free, and that the Spirit of God 'bloweth where it listeth.' There is a great opportunity here for preaching with new emphasis the gospel of the grace of God, and for setting forth Him whom men still ignorantly worship as He reveals Himself in providential care, moral discipline, and redemptive passion. The men of to-day will never be content with an easy religion, with 'a god of things as they are.' They can best be appealed to by the prospect of adventure, and the call to heroism and self-sacrifice will not fall on deaf ears. The God they seek must be one who not only supplies all their needs, but claims them as fellow-workers in the great task of re-establishing His Kingdom on the earth. Such an one they find in the God who was 'in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself,' and 'in whose service there is perfect freedom.' Their aim is thus religious and practical in the first instance, and cannot be better expressed than in the words of Mr. Balfour in the beginning of his Gifford Lectures, 'When I speak of God, I mean something more than an identity wherein all differences vanish, or a unity which includes, but does not transcend, the differences which somehow it holds in solution. I mean a God whom men can love, to whom men can pray, who takes sides, who has purposes and preferences, whose attributes, however conceived, leave unimpaired the possibility of a personal relation between Himself and those whom He has created.'

Literature.

SAMUEL BUTLER.

It would be a pity, a very great pity, if those who read the first volume of *Samuel Butler, Author of 'Erewhon' (1835–1902): A Memoir,* by Mr. Henry Festing Jones (Macmillan; 42s. net), were too weary with it to proceed to the second. It is a volume of 478 pages (including the Preface), most of them in small type, and (to characterize it generally) when it is not dull it is disappointing. Butler, we are told, was a man of exceptional ability; all we see is exceptional versatility. He tries many things—theology, photography, music, teaching, ranching, painting, poetry, science—and fails in every one of them. His only success is in the making of enemies. He quarrels with all his own folk at home. He quarrels with religious folk everywhere. He quarrels with scientific folk wherever he can get them to look at him. We are near the end of the volume when we read: 'I am quite ready to admit that I am in a conspiracy of one against men of science in general, with an extra slouch of the hat for Mr. Grant Allen in particular.'

The dullness of the book is due partly, perhaps chiefly, to the letters of Miss Savage, a lady who, the biographer informs us, wished to marry Butler, but had to recognize at last that he did not wish to marry her. He encouraged her to write to him, and her long uninteresting letters occupy nearly a fourth part of the volume. Not once have we found a memorable or a kindly sentence in them. There is plenty of clever flippancy, even blasphemy if you choose to call it so, for when a woman openly goes in for irreligion she becomes as hopeless as one who secretly goes in for drink. Butler himself broke with Christianity, or rather with Christian people, but he never became irreligious. What made him encourage Miss Savage was simply the fact that she appreciated him, and did so with an abandon that satisfied even his sensitiveness. We shall not quote any of her references to divine things, but this is a flattering example of her way with human beings: '4 Dec. 1880—Apropos of odious creatures, I saw Mr. Gladstone last week. He came out of Lord Selborne's house in Portland Place. He was looking dreadfully cross and very yellow. He seemed undecided as to where he should cross the street, and he stared at me in a helpless sort of way as if he expected me to offer him some advice on the matter; but, as there was no possibility of putting him in the way of being run over, I refrained from giving an opinion. The crossings about Portland Place are so stupidly safe.'

A little of that may be entertaining, but nearly a hundred pages of it in the smallest type! And then there are Butler's replies, perhaps half as

many pages and still more prosaic. If she disliked God, he disliked men. We recall his disparagement of the Brownings, Rossetti, Edwin Abbott, Seeley, Charles Lamb, Alfred Ainger, John Morley, Sir George Trevelyan, George Elliot, Dante, Darwin, and there must be many more.

And so we lay down the first volume with a bad taste in the mouth.

But the second. At last Butler had found his work, and with his work himself. It was the sense of failure that soured him; the sense of success, or at least of accomplishment,—for outward success he never had—restored him.

The opening is bad. Why does Mr. Jones record all this spiteful chatter about Butler's sisters? And it is they, not he, that have the best of it. They have the best of it in repartee as well as in charity. But very soon we come upon this—think of it: 'I liked the Archbishop of York; Lord Cranbrook seemed a good fellow; Moss was civil to me; Sir Henry Dryden made the best speech and the one which his audience evidently liked best. Canon Hornby looked good; so did Archdeacon Hamilton. There was a good old clergyman opposite me, a pupil of my grandfather's, who said, "Butler (meaning my grandfather) was as good a man as ever lived," and evidently meant what he said.'

He liked an archbishop! And yet, even yet: 'I am aware that the sexual question is of more practical importance than any such as Christianity can be; at the same time, till Christianity is dead and buried, we shall never get the burning questions that lie beyond approached in a spirit of sobriety and commonsense. It is therefore against superstition, and more especially the Christian superstition, that I have fought to the best of my ability.'

What his opinion of Christianity was worth may be judged from this sentence: 'Tell me that Jesus Christ died upon the Cross, and I find not one tittle of evidence worthy of the name to support the assertion.'

Butler wrote *The Life and Letters of Dr. Samuel Butler*, his grandfather, and the study of that life and these letters seems to have opened his eyes to the worth of, at any rate, *some* Christians. He says: 'His straightforwardness, robustness, generous placability, kindness of heart, laboriousness, and a hundred other good qualities, have made me fairly lose my heart to him.' No doubt it was his grandfather's humour that captured him. Even this: 'As the doctor was entering the schoolroom one day, a writing on the wall by some boy of the lower school caught his eye: "Butler is an old fool." "Ah," said Dr. Butler, "the melancholy truth stares me in the face."'

There was yet another thing. His father (with whom he was always at war) died, and henceforth Butler had no anxiety about money. He could publish his books and pay for the publishing. He could even publish prose translations of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and enjoy the translation if not the publication. More than that. He could now afford a gentleman's man. And he found Alfred so nearly perfect that he consulted him and followed his advice on everything. Now he could spend a week-end in an episcopal palace —it is Peterborough, and the bishop is Mandell Creighton—and write: 'I went and enjoyed myself very much. I should like to add that there are very few men who have ever impressed me so profoundly and so favourably as Dr. Creighton. I have often seen him since, both at Peterborough and at Fulham, and like and admire him most cordially.' It has to be known that Alfred advised it. 'Let me have a look at his letter, Sir.' I gave him the letter, and he said: 'I see, Sir, there is a crumb of tobacco in it; I think you may go.'

And Butler impressed the young people at the palace favourably, so favourably that one of them (now the Rev. Cuthbert Creighton) read his books afterwards, and then wrote to his biographer, and said: 'I can now see shining, or perhaps I might rather say twinkling, through his pages the personality of a man of rare loveable character, one who, though this may sound an unexpected note on which to end and though the idea would have brought an incredulous smile to his lips, always seems to me to have had in him something of what I conceive to be saintliness.'

Saint Samuel Butler!

A PRIVATE IN THE GUARDS.

Mr. Stephen Graham, the author of *Priest of the Ideal* and *The Quest of the Face*, enlisted as *A Private in the Guards*, and under that title he has written and published the story of his adventures (Macmillan; 10s. net). It was a remarkable thing to do; he was alone in his education and refinement; his experience was almost unbearably hard; but we rejoice that he did it, for otherwise we

should not have had the most graphic account of the private soldier's life in the great war which has been written.

He went through the drill at Little Sparta, and at last the civilian can realize what the discipline of the army cost. He had a place in some of the hottest of the fighting, and we almost share the fighting with him. He took part in the great march to Cologne, and he leaves us thinking over the nameless crosses which he passed on the way. One grave he saw, dug by Germans, was marked in English 'Anonymous England—3.' The date was given 21.3.1918.

'Such crosses,' he says, 'without particulars, are generally called "Lonely Soldiers," and much love is always lavished on them by the private soldier bringing wild flowers to them, making formal gardens round them of glass and chalk. There is a feeling that the unknown dead have made a deeper and a sweeter sacrifice than even those who perished and were known and were buried "with name and number." There is a pathos about the dead who have neither number nor name, and in reacting to it the soldier's instinct is true. Theirs has been that holiest sacrifice, and it is fitting we should carry the brightest tokens of victory, and put them on the grave of —Anonymous England.'

He is proud of his regiment. 'There was current among us a quaint parody of Browning:

> God's in His heaven,
> The Guard's in the line,

which was whispered from man to man, though probably no one in the ranks of our battalion could have quoted the original. However, the fact was true: the Guard was in the line, and all was right with the world.'

He startles us with his chapter on the padres. 'Graham,' said one, 'if there's one thing more than another that is important in this war, it is that the whisky supply should not get low.' He startles us also with his own idea of religion: 'I know purity has little to do with religion, and that the first thing to obtain is a loving and humble heart.' But there is another sentence: 'Their life was sometimes praised as "Camaraderie," the sense of comradeship; sometimes as "Devotion to Duty," sometimes as "Valour." It was most truly Christianity; for does not Christianity mean the suffering of the *One* that *All* may have more life, the bread and wine of the New Testament which makes us all one Body and one Spirit?'

He tells us that many mottoes have been suggested for the war monuments that are to be raised on the battlefields of France and Flanders. One is, 'They died for Freedom'; one, 'What I gave I have'; one, 'My utmost for the Highest'; and Kipling's happy words, 'Who stands if Freedom fall? Who dies if England live?' But the motto that has been adopted, and is to be used by all the Allies, he seems to say, is one that Kipling found in Ecclesiasticus: 'Their Name liveth for evermore.'

OUTSPOKEN ESSAYS.

It was the verdict of one Church Elder on another that he was 'most awfu' countermashious,' and the Dean of St. Paul's, who knows so much, will know what was meant. He has himself given the title of *Outspoken Essays* to his new volume (Longmans; 6s. net). With 'institutional Christianity' he will simply have nothing to do, and as nearly all our Christianity is institutional, the field for outspokenness is pretty wide.

Dr. Inge makes strong statements about other things. For those who take an interest in society this: 'The method of Christianity is alien to all externalism and machinery; it does not lend itself to those accommodations and compromises without which nothing can be done in politics. As Harnack says, the Gospel is not one of social improvement, but of spiritual redemption. Its influence upon social and political life is indirect and obscure, operating through a subtle modification of current valuations, and curbing the competitive and acquisitive instincts, which nearly correspond with what Christ called "Mammon" and St. Paul "the flesh." Christianity is a spiritual dynamic, which has very little to do directly with the mechanism of social life.'

For those who are inclined to nibble at spiritualism, he says: 'It is a retrogade theory which we are asked to re-examine and perhaps accept. The moment we are asked to accept "scientific evidence" for spiritual truth, the alleged spiritual truth becomes for us neither spiritual nor true. It is degraded into an event in the phenomenal world, and when so degraded it cannot be substantiated. Psychical research is trying to prove

that eternal values are temporal facts, which they can never be.'

And for the admirers of President Wilson this: 'President Wilson's declaration that "a steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations; for no autocratic government could ever be trusted to keep faith within it," is one of the most childish exhibitions of doctrinaire *naïveté* which ever proceeded from the mouth of a public man.'

But, as we have said, it is institutional religion that is his abhorrence. There are two kinds of religion, the institutional and the mystical (we used to call them the priestly and the prophetic), and all that Christianity is suffering from is due to the former. At the end of a strong and long indictment, he says: 'In conclusion, our answer to the indictment against Christianity is that institutional religion does not represent the Gospel of Christ, but the opinions of a mass of nominal Christians. It cannot be expected to do much more than look after its own interests and reflect the moral ideas of its supporters.'

THE BENEDICTINES.

The Right Rev. Cuthbert Butler, Abbot of Downside Abbey, has written the Apologia of his Order. He calls the book *Benedictine Monachism* (Longmans; 18s.). What are his credentials? He thinks we ought to know.

'In the first place, then, I have been for more than forty years a Benedictine monk, living the life according to the Rule, and trying to shape my spiritual life and my intellectual and other activities by its inspiration and teaching; and during the last twelve of these years I have had the experience of ruling as Abbot over a large monastery. All through my monastic life my study of predilection has been the domain of monastic history and literature, both general, especially the early phases, and Benedictine in particular; and I have devoted some years to the preparation of an edition of the text of the Rule itself. Moreover, I have made visits, sometimes of considerable duration, at Benedictine monasteries in Italy, Switzerland, France, the Rhineland, Bavaria, Austria, Hungary, Belgium; so that I have had the opportunity of seeing the actual working of modern Benedictinism in all its manifestations as found at the present day throughout Europe.'

In an early chapter Dom Butler tells us what Benedict did for Monasticism. His special contribution was *stability*. 'Up to his time monks, though looked upon as bound, whether by vows or without them, irrevocably to the practice of the monastic life, so that to abandon it was considered an apostasy, still were not tied to a particular monastery or community, but were allowed with little difficulty to pass from one house to another. St. Benedict's most special and tangible contribution to the development of monasticism was the introduction of the vow of stability. He put a stop to such liberty of passage from monastery to monastery, and incorporated the monk by his profession in the community of his own monastery. St. Benedict thus bound the monks of a monastery together into a permanent family, united by bonds that lasted for life.'

Benedict called the monastery 'a school of the service of God.' There were to be 'three services'—Self-discipline, Prayer, Work. By making work (mostly manual labour) one of the services he delivered his monks from the idea that the contemplative life was opposed to the active life. But he laid it down explicitly that both must be pursued, citing the example of our Lord: 'Christ set forth in Himself patterns of both lives, that is the active and the contemplative, united together. For the contemplative differs very much from the active. But our Redeemer by coming Incarnate, while He gave a pattern of both, united both in Himself. For when He wrought miracles in the city, and yet continued all night in prayer on the mountain, He gave his faithful ones an example not to neglect, through love of contemplation, the care of their neighbours; nor again to abandon contemplative pursuits, from being too immoderately engaged in the care of their neighbours: but so to combine these things, by applying their mind to both, that the love of their neighbour may not interfere with the love of God; nor again the love of God cast out, because it transcends, the love of their neighbour (*Morals*, xxviii. 33).'

In the chapter on Mysticism, Abbot Butler says: '"Mysticism may broadly be described as the effort to give effect to the craving for a union of the soul with the Deity already in this life"; a craving which may well be called a common instinct of the religiously awakened soul. This same, the traditional Catholic conception of contemplation and mysticism, is adopted in the

excellent introductory section of the article "Mysticism" in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, where the writer, a well-informed and sympathetic nonconformist, accepts the old idea, but expresses it in the language of modern psychology—"the doctrine of the soul's possible union (*i.e.* in this life) with Absolute Reality, that is, with God." This section will well repay study, as also will the singularly able and illuminating section on "Roman Catholic Mysticism," by Dom John Chapman (*ibid.*).'

In a later chapter on the spiritual writers among the Benedictines he gives a careful résumé of Dom Chapman's article.

THE NEW ELIZABETHANS.

The New Elizabethans are the young men of talent who fell in the great War. A short biography of twenty-four of them, poets nearly all, has been written by E. B. Osborn (John Lane). And there is a portrait in the book of every one of the twenty-four.

Our first thought is of the awful waste of young ardent educated gifted human life. Speaking of an Irish poet, who is not included in this list, Lord Dunsany says: 'He has gone down in that vast maelstrom into which poets do well to adventure and from which their country might perhaps be wise to withhold them, but that is our Country's affair.' Yes, but has 'our country' been aware of its responsibility? Will 'our country' ever realize what it gave away with these men?

There are, however, two things to be said in reply. One, that the country could not help itself, the other, that on no account would these young men have had it otherwise. They repudiate the thought which to us seems so inevitably true—that early death is loss irretrievable. Harold Chapin is the first of the new Elizabethans to be commemorated in this book, the second is Richard Dennys; and this is what Richard Dennys says:

My share of fourscore years and ten
I'll gladly yield to any man,
And take no thought of 'where' or 'when,'
Contented with my shorter span.
For I have learned what love may be,
And found a heart that understands,
And known a comrade's constancy,
And felt the grip of friendly hands.

So it is well with the lads. Is it well with us? That is the question which has to be answered and in its answer lies the vindication of the way of God with them.

If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep.

AUGUSTINE'S CONFESSIONS.

If we pursue the thought of social salvation too exclusively, there is risk of a reaction. And, after all, individual salvation is the first even if it is not the greatest fact. It is the saved man who seeks to be the saviour of other men. Let us keep our own soul's salvation before us, in defiance of the scorn of those literary persons who do not know how brilliant salvation is. And that we may do so let us read Augustine's Confessions, with such an introduction to the same as Canon R. L. Ottley has provided in his *Studies in the Confessions of St. Augustine* (Scott).

Canon Ottley shows very clearly that in Augustine's day the great danger was the social environment. It was not that men worked for the salvation of their fellow-men and forgot, like Wilberforce, that they themselves had souls to save. It was that the Christian society was less Christian than it is even now, and escape—into a monastery, for example—seemed to be the only way of keeping oneself spiritually alive. Monasticism, says Dr. Ottley, 'found its mainspring and root not so much in desire for the imitation of Christ as in an inarticulate consciousness of the dignity and value of individuality. It was as an assertion of the principle that religion implies a direct personal relationship to God, and that the kingdom of God realizes itself in individual souls before it finds outward expression in a visible organization.'

The study of the Confessions, and of this Introduction in particular, is valuable because neither individualism nor socialism is allowed to occupy all the attention. 'Augustine represents a type of personal religion which has endured and will endure, since it takes into account two permanent elements in human nature. On the one hand, religion necessarily implies a personal relationship between the soul and its Creator; and it was through the study of his own personality and spiritual capacities that Augustine attained to the knowledge of God. Indeed, as Dr. Bright points

out, "No Christian writer has ever been more thoroughly penetrated by a sense of what is involved in the words 'My God.'" On the other hand, through his social instincts, Augustine discovered the true place of corporate life in the discipline of character: the function of the Church in the renewal and training of personality.'

THE HOLY SHEKEL.

Those who are collecting dedications may add this to their list: 'To a world in which the true moral and religious sense which should have uplifted humanity to the ends of progress and happiness has been suppressed for a while and suffered to be held in subjection by a monstrous war, this collection of maxims and sayings evidencing the wisdom of the Ancients is dedicated by the author, looking forward to an era of universal love and brotherhood.'

It is Dr. Hermann Gollancz's dedication to his edition of *Shekel Hakodesh*; *or, The Holy Shekel* (Milford; 21s. net). Dr. Gollancz has edited that Hebrew work for the first time from the manuscripts in the Bodleian, and has issued it along with an English translation, notes, and introduction.

The Shekel Hakodesh is the work of Joseph Kimchi of Narbonne, the father of the celebrated grammarians, David and Moses Kimchi. He lived from 1105 to 1170. It is a collection of ethical and moral maxims. Kimchi claims no credit for originality, yet 'he was not a slavish translator or borrower; he was not wedded to any one collection of ethical and moral maxims. Though he was not quite an independent and original author, he yet followed a method and arrangement of his own, and he has his own way of applying scriptural expressions and phrases.' Dr. Gollancz has investigated the sources of his compilation with patience and much learning, and if he is not quite satisfied with the result (for it is a most complicated business), there is no doubt that he has brought us much nearer the truth.

Dr. Gollancz has included in this fine volume the text (with translation, notes, and introduction) of another Hebrew work, the Yesod Hayirah. Once before, but only once, has this work been printed, in the periodical entitled 'Mekize Nirdamim,' in 1896. He does not know who was the author of the Yesod, and he does not investigate the matter. 'I have introduced the *Yesod Hayirah* into this volume for quite another reason, and that is, that it may help to throw some light upon our present enquiry with regard to the ultimate sources of the "Mibchar" and the "Shekel." It struck me in the course of my reading that several unusual expressions occurred in the "Yesod," identical with such as occurred in both the "Mibchar" and the "Shekel": this seemed to me far from accidental; and the question thereupon presented itself to my mind—Who borrowed from Whom?'

The Yesod Hayirah, that is, *The Foundation of Religious Fear*, is a collection of parental instructions to children. It is divided into eighteen chapters: on Fear, on Prayer and Service, on the Law and Wisdom (a long chapter), on Appreciation, on Shame and Shamelessness, and so forth. Here is a paragraph on Meekness: 'Know that meekness conquers the wrath of man, which rises to overwhelm him; it stills a king's anger, making his will like the dew upon the herb. How soon the cold stream will still the seething kettle, even though its smoke has risen!'

In the Shekel there are twenty-two chapters: On Wisdom, on Humility, on Abstinence, on Modesty and Shame, on Self-denial, and the like. The last maxim in every chapter contains a word the letters of which are equal in their numerical value to the number of maxims in the chapter. Thus: 'Deal kindly while the breath of life is within thee, ere *hither* and thither thou flittest, and thy righteousness goeth before thee.

'["Hither" = 25, the number of lines in this section.]'

A FAITH-HEALER AND SPIRITUALIST.

For a long time one is puzzled to understand why Mrs. Steuart Erskine has edited the *Memoirs of Edward, Eighth Earl of Sandwich* (Murray; 16s. net). Page after page is filled with extracts from the Earl's diary, a diary which he seems to have kept conscientiously throughout his life, but which contains the barest statement of his daily doings. 'I am writing at midnight with my window open, looking out on the harbour of Genoa, with a lovely view and a bright moon. We arrived this evening from Nice by steamer—glorious day, but a very heavy swell. As we were in a long, very small, and very narrow boat, we rolled like fun all day. We shall probably go on Saturday to Spezzia and then straight to Naples. I fear the eruption is over, but

we shall see the remains of it. We shall go back to Rome afterwards.' That is a perfectly fair example.

The Earl of Sandwich was neither politician, diplomatist, nor philanthropist. When he succeeded his father he was forty-five. 'He was unmarried, his early engagement having been broken off. His character, always original, some said eccentric, had crystallised as the years went on. In some respects he was a man who seldom did himself justice and who was often much misunderstood. Naturally warm-hearted and sensitive, he had got into the habit of hiding his feelings under a joking or sarcastic exterior. One who knew him well said of him that "he had a habit of commanding which inclined him to speak in an autocratic manner; this instilled a fear of him in his subordinates, and, except for a few close friends, his character was too domineering and self-assertive to be popular amongst men of his own age and standing. A mixture of pettiness and greatness, he found it difficult to forgive and certainly never forgot."'

'Lord Sandwich's attitude to his servants was rather unusual. The butler had been with his father for many years before he succeeded, and was already a friend of the family. He always spoke to him as *Mr.* Cooper, and addressed so much of his conversation to him at dinner that a friend once complained that he addressed his conversation to his servants at dinner and to his horses out driving; consequently it was no use going to stay with him.'

And we read on, wondering. Then we reach the chapter 'On Healing,' and the secret is out. *The eighth Earl of Sandwich was a faith-healer.* He made the discovery quite accidentally, and he exercised the gift with a proper sense of responsibility and reserve. When he gave evidence before the Bishop of Winchester's committee some years ago he claimed only occasional success. But he was thoroughly convinced of the fact of healing by faith and of his own power to heal.

Then entered the spiritualist. 'Early in the year 1911, an American lady, Mrs. Herbine, was introduced into the family and came to stay at Hinchingbrooke. She has a remarkable psychic gift, and has communicated with a spirit calling himself Dr. Coulter ever since she was a child. This spirit always told her that she would come to England, as he wished to get into touch with many English people, amongst whom were my uncle and certain members of our family.' Henceforward all that Lord Sandwich did he did under the immediate direction of Dr. Coulter. 'At a request from Dr. Coulter, my uncle, accompanied by Mrs. Herbine and myself, went to India in November, 1912, to bring certain rajahs and their people in touch with Dr. Coulter and Spiritual Healing. I must say, wherever we travelled, it made a vast impression for good on the Indians that an old gentleman of seventy-five years should leave his comfortable home and travel all those miles to bring them the message of Love and Unity and Healing.' 'Of course our journey was entirely controlled by Dr. Coulter, who told us where to go, to whom he wished to speak, and how long we were to stay at any given place.'

THE NEW EDUCATION IN MISSIONS.

The Rev. Roland Allen, M.A., is fully convinced of the value of those methods in education which are so revolutionary that their advocates call themselves the new teachers, and their system the new teaching. The chief of the new educators is Dr. Montessori; their best-known ambassador in this country is Professor John Adams. Mr. Allen, wholly converted, wants to apply the system to the work of the foreign missionary. For that purpose he has written a book and called it *Educational Principles and Missionary Methods* (Scott; 7s. 6d. net).

It is a most readable book, and, missionary or minister, we had better read it. But the whole point and pith of it has been put into an illustration which forms the last chapter. This is the illustration:

'A few months before his consecration as Bishop of Dornakal, Mr. Azariah, in a letter to a friend in England, said: "At this place there is only one family of Christians. . . . I was trying to tell the evangelists the new method of training the congregations; and I gave model lessons in this congregation. The man for the first time opened his mouth to pray. He said, 'Oh Father who art in Heaven, You are our Father, we are Your Children. Keep us all well. Heal my rheumatism and my child's boil. Keep us from all wild animals, the bear and the tiger. Forgive us our sins, our quarrels, angry words, all that we have done since morning. Make us good. Bring all the castes to kneel down to You and call You

Father.' He did not know that he ought to finish it in a set fashion, and I thought I would not trouble him with the Greek 'Amen.' For two months the catechist had tried to teach the Telugu Lord's Prayer, but 'it will not come' to him. The young boy was the only one who could proceed unaided up to 'Lead us not.' We felt greatly encouraged at this result. On the second day his relation, an equally brainless man, joined and offered another beautiful prayer."'

Now that incident illustrates all the principles underlying the new education and Mr. Allen's book.

First, 'the pupil is put into his proper place in the thought of the educator. The first and sole consideration is his progress.' Next, 'the lesson is based on real knowledge of the people with whom the teacher had to do.' It is extremely simple. It is based of course upon true and deep Christian ideas. But in form it is designed rather to lead up to Christian ideas, and to strictly Christian practice, than to enforce the precise observation of these at the moment.' Thirdly, 'there is a true conception of the end, a real end is attained in that one lesson. This lesson is not simply a preparation for another lesson. It is not merely a part of an education which is to be carried on hereafter. The end is to be attained here and now, and the hearers arrive at it.' In the fourth place, there is development. 'This lesson on prayer is based upon the known nature and history of the learners. We can see an enormous advance made by them. They themselves have developed under this teaching. They have grown.' Fifthly, 'there is real instruction resulting in knowledge. Knowledge of God, knowledge of the relationship in which the learners stood to Him, knowledge of His nature, of His power, of His willingness to hear prayer, of the proper attitude in which to approach Him, of the need of forgiveness, of the relation of men to their fellow-men; all this and much more is strongly apprehended. It is real knowledge, it is significant, it is intimately connected with life and experience.' Again, 'there is activity. The educands are active throughout.' Once more, there is liberty: 'external liberty to express themselves as they please without interference; internal liberty, the attainment of power to direct their own actions. And with liberty comes discipline, self-control, consideration for the needs of others.' Last of all, 'there is experiment. There is here an excellent example of the experimental method of education, experiment both on the part of the teacher and of the taught; experiment which enlightened both teacher and taught. There is a note of gratified expectation, if not of joyful surprise, in Mr. Azariah's remark that he felt "greatly encouraged at this result." And I suspect that if these Telugu outcastes were capable of giving us their version of the story we should find in it a similar note of delight if not of surprise—a certain joyfulness in the sense that the experiment involved in the lesson has succeeded. The result of the lesson was a true experience.'

MATILDA BETHAM-EDWARDS.

In her *Mid-Victorian Memories* (Murray; 10s. 6d. net), the late Miss Betham-Edwards says pleasant things about some of the great men and women whom she met in her long life. She says unpleasant things of nobody. But there is a touch of disdain in her description of Coventry Patmore's second wife, who 'brought him so many thousand pounds,' and 'was very dear at the money.' 'Stepmotherhood was not field wide enough for the handsome, imperious mistress of old Hastings House. She should have been an abbess of some convent famed for its asceticism.' 'It was soon after the poet's settling down that I was invited to a luncheon given in honour of the event. On entering the drawing-room, my eyes immediately rested on a sumptuous woman standing in the centre of a group; she wore over her black satin dress a gold chain, not round her neck, but, doubtless with some fantastic meaning, encircling her waist. But what at once struck observers was her beaming look of triumph. Well, indeed, from her point of view might she triumph! Had not the Cardinal's convert been the means of bringing not only her poet, but those belonging to him, within the pale of Rome? That beaming look was always there. A cultivated woman of the world, an ardent *dévote*, she saw everything from one standpoint only. Graciousness she was itself, and fond of society, as she frankly admitted. Upon one occasion, when we had discussed theological questions, fearing that she had not made her meaning transparent, she wrote to me that same evening: "You will understand me when I say that I have more fellow-feeling with an ignorant, dirty old Breton peasant woman who belongs to my religion than with any outsider, no matter how gifted."

The word "timid" occurs in Mr. Gosse's three or four lines of characterisation. Never did any woman possess a more imperious will than the second Mrs. Patmore; never did any more completely wield "all the rule, one umpire." Thus for many years Coventry Patmore submitted to both spiritual and domestic sway. The autocratic rule of his household during that period was strictly a feminine one.'

As offset to that sole example of sharpish criticism take this about George Eliot: 'Even her best friend could not introduce anyone without permission. So I waited inside the gate till my hostess beckoned me, and there I was in the presence of a tall, prematurely-old lady wearing black, with a majestic but appealing and wholly unforgettable face. A subdued yet penetrating light—I am tempted to say luminosity—shone from large dark eyes that looked all the darker on account of the white, marble-like complexion. She might have sat for a Santa Teresa.'

Later she met Sir Frederick Leighton at George Eliot's house. 'On this Sunday afternoon he seemed oblivious of everything around him, his eyes fixed on the priestess-like, rather Sybil-like figure opposite. After a mechanically uttered phrase or two he burst out—a lover's voice could hardly have been more impassioned:

'"How beautiful she is!"

'After all, was not the artist right? What is physical perfection compared to spiritual beauty, the inner radiance that transforms, etherialises features not flawless according to rule of thumb?'

But the best of the book is Mrs. Sarah Grand's 'personal sketch' of its author—the little old lady with the precise old-style courtesy, and the messages sent in front to hosts, telling exactly what must be provided—cotton sheets, dark rooms, and a glass of very light Chablis at lunch.

Mr. R. Travers Herford, B.A., has made himself 'advocatus pharisæorum' among the Gentiles. He was wisely chosen by the Jewish Historical Society to deliver the second 'Arthur Davis Memorial Lecture.' He delivered it at University College on Sunday, April 6, 1919 / Nisam 5679. Its subject was *What the World owes to the Pharisees*. The lecture is now published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin; 1s. net), with a Foreword by Lieut.-General Sir John Monash, who presided; and an Afterword by Captain Herbert M. Adler.

Can trade be carried on by a Christian? Is it possible in our day for a man to be both diligent in business and also serve the Lord? Ask men like Lord Leverhulme, Mr. G. J. Wardle, M.P., Mr. A. Lyle Samuel, M.P., or Dr. John Clifford; or ask a woman like Miss A. Maude Royden. You will find their answer in *The Industrial Future in the Light of the Brotherhood Ideal* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). They will all tell you that they believe it is possible; they will all tell you that they know it is not easy. 'As I visualize it,' says Mr. J. A. Seddon, M.P., 'the real problem is whether we can apply the ethics of common Christianity to industrial economics, which are sustenance and gain.'

Once in a way a great sermon has been preached on an unfamiliar text. But not often. The Rev. Archibald Alexander, M.A., B.D., is, however, not careful to preach great sermons. He is content and even anxious to preach homely sermons to homely people. And he must be allowed to find his texts where he will. He chooses 'On all manner of instruments' (2 S 6^5), for one; 'Unto this last' (Mt 20^{14}), for another; 'Grey hairs are here and there upon him, but he knoweth not' (Hos 7^9), for a third. But he chooses good strong texts also—texts that like the cedars of Lebanon are full of sap—and he handles them sanely. One thing is unfailing—contact with his hearers' minds. The title is *The Stuff of Life* (Allenson; 5s. net).

In 1910 a Jewish woman living in London received from her doctor the intimation that the disease she suffered from was incurable and she had not long to live. The intimation made a great impression on her. She was a rationalist. She did not believe in another state of existence; she did not believe in a God who was external to her own conscience. At first the thought that the end of life, which was the end of everything, was near, quite overwhelmed her. Then she began to brace herself. She opened a correspondence with her doctor, who was an evangelical Christian. Her letters were long and numerous and unreserved. They are now published. The volume is entitled *Words in Pain* (Bishop; 7s. 6d. net).

No reply from the doctor is given in the book. But that does not matter. We understand him and we understand her. From first to last it is the cry of a courageous clever woman for strength to meet death, strength which she might have found at once and restfully in the felt presence of God. She did find comfort in her husband, her family, and her physician. For with all her fierceness against Christianity (and she grew fiercer as the night drew nearer) she was surrounded by Christian sympathy, and by that alone was she sustained. Her family was not her own; it was adopted. And where did she learn the secret of that love which 'beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things'? Not in herself. At moments she was free enough to confess it, though again she read Huxley and quoted Henley:

> Out of the night that covers me,
> Black as the Pit from pole to pole,
> I thank whatever Gods may be
> For my unconquerable soul,

and determined to trust in her own strong will, 'not to overcome misfortune, but to try to bear it as bravely as possible.'

The whole trouble came from the idea that God, the God of the Christian, is external and far away.

The volume entitled *The Spread of Christianity in the Modern World* (Cambridge University Press; $2 net) does not contain the Dale Lectures delivered by Professor Edward Caldwell Moore of Harvard University in Mansfield College, Oxford, in 1913. But it contains in its Introduction a brief statement of the 'general considerations which are elaborated' in these lectures. The Dale Lectures have not yet been issued. 'This book attempts a survey of the history of missions since the beginning of the modern era.'

Professor Caldwell Moore has the several gifts that are requisite for this difficult work. He is deeply interested in the extension of the Kingdom —that first and foremost. He has been for twenty years in closest association with other men who are interested. He has a clear mind and a graphic pen.

To those who 'think imperially' the country of most Christian longing is Japan. Not very great encouragement is yet to be found, but Dr. Moore has this to say: 'A step which surely marked the beginning of an era in the religious history of Japan was taken in January 1912, when Mr. Tokoname, vice-minister of education, announced to a meeting of representatives of the press that the government had decided to recognize Christianity as a religion which it was prepared to encourage. Among other things he said: "The culture of national ethics can be perfected by education combined with religion. At present moral doctrines are inculcated by education alone. It is impossible to inculcate fair and upright ideas in the mind of the nation unless the people are brought into touch with the fundamental conception known as God, Buddha, or Heaven, as taught in religions." He ended by expressing the hope that Christianity "would step out of the narrow circle within which it was confined and endeavour to conform to the national polity and adapt itself to the national sentiments and customs in order to insure greater achievements." One result of this action on the part of the government was that a conference of certain representatives of the three religions, Shinto, Buddhism, and Christianity, was held on February 25, 1912, which was attended also by several members of the cabinet. In the distribution of honours at the coronation of the present Emperor, in 1915, a number of Japanese Christians of different vocations were singled out for honour. Surely these facts give some measure of the remarkable change which has taken place in the attitude of the nation toward Christianity since 1868.'

At the office of *The Challenge* there are published in one pamphlet, with the title of *The Way to Industrial Peace* (4d.), two outspoken sermons by the Rev. Albert D. Belden, B.D. In one the central statement is: 'The only way to Industrial Peace is by the thorough reorganization of our commercial system from private to public ownership.' In the other the author says that the world's way of life is 'obvious immorality,' and we must *combine* in order to attack and overthrow it.

In *Christ Crucified the Power of God and the Wisdom of God* (Chapman & Hall; 4s. 6d. net), the author of *The Worship of the Dead* — it is betraying no secret surely to say that Col. Garnier is his name—has stated his conception of what used to be called the scheme of salvation. His way of life is the way of Christ and the

apostles, unless we read the New Testament all awry. One thing sometimes found there he repudiates — substitution. The whole idea of 'expiation' is abhorrent to him, and he gives good reason for his abhorrence.

A Day-Book of Walter Savage Landor, chosen by John Bailey, has been published at the Clarendon Press (cloth, 2s. 6d.; paper, 2s.). Mr. Bailey, for one, knows Landor: how many more do? This selection will be an introduction to Landor, as the selection of Ruskin's thoughts was to Ruskin and of Browning's poems to Browning. We quote one saying. Notice that it is uttered by David Hume:

'*Hume.* It would be presumptuous in me to quote the Bible to you, who are so much more conversant in it; yet I cannot refrain from repeating for my own satisfaction the beautiful sentence on holiness: that "all her ways are pleasantness and all her paths are peace." It says not one or two paths, but *all*.'

There are many men and some women who, the war being over, find themselves at a loose end. They do not know what to do next. For them the Rev. Basil Mathews has edited a volume with the title of *Essays on Vocation* (Milford; 3s. 6d. net). Some of the professions and trades are chosen (it is only the first volume of a series) and expert men and women have been found to write articles on them in order to show the opportunity they offer for life-work. Sir William Osler writes on Medicine and Nursing, Sir Ernest Pollock on Law, Mr. J. Lewis Paton on Education, the Rev. Edward Shillito on the Ministry, Mr. H. Walford Davies on Art, Mr. W. H. Somervell on Commerce, Mr. Archibald Ramage on Industry, Miss Fanny Street on Elementary Teaching, and Miss Emily E. Whimster on the Home. Every author is, as we have said, an expert; more than that, every author can write clearly and sympathetically.

There is a fine flavour of good literature about the papers which the Rev. John A. Hutton, D.D., publishes under the title of *On Accepting Ourselves* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net). One of them was spoken at a Robert Burns Anniversary, and has literature for its topic. But every other one is saturated with the thoughts that come to a man of wide culture and fine apprehension. And then they are one and all set forth for the purpose of commending the grace of God in Christ, so that every literary reference is taken up into a great purpose and made use of for a high end.

The Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes, B.A., D.D., is the author of *The Theology of Experience*, one of the best books on that most difficult subject. His new volume of sermons will find a way made for them. The title is *Faith and Progress* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net). They are right readable, for they are in touch with life. Dr. Hughes is not unorthodox, but it is not orthodoxy one thinks of, it is vitality. 'The Fellowship of the Burning Heart' is good enough to gain the prize if there were a Newdigate for sermons. Its text is, of course, 'Was not our heart burning within us, while he spake to us in the way, while he opened to us the Scriptures' (Lk 24^{32}). The divisions are the Burning Heart, (1) its Secret, (2) its Vision, (3) its Power, (4) its Fellowship.

Messrs. Constable are still reprinting *Thoughts on Life and Religion*, an Aftermath from the Writings of the Right Hon. Professor Max Müller, by his Wife (3s. net). You may take these two as fair examples of the thoughts:

'True religion, that is practical, active, living religion, has little or nothing to do with logical or metaphysical quibbles. Practical religion is life, is a new life, a life in the sight of God, and it springs from what may truly be called a new birth.'

'I cannot bring myself to take much interest in all the controversies that are going on (1865) in the Church of England. . . . No doubt the points at issue are great, and appeal to our hearts and minds, but the spirit in which they are treated seems to me very small. How few men on either side give you the impression that they write face to face with God, and not face to face with men and the small powers that be. Surely this was not so in the early centuries, nor again at the time of the Reformation?'

The Rev. H. G. Tunnicliff, B.A., has used his gift of understanding—the understanding of the mind of children—in telling *The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). It was never told with more entertainment. And as it is with the children's sermon in church, so it

is likely to be with this pleasant portable history—the children's fathers and mothers will enjoy it as much as the children.

Every new volume by Mr. F. W. Boreham is a surprise. For every volume is as fresh as the first. We have read them all, and there are eight of them. Yet this volume called *The Uttermost Star* (Epworth Press; 5s. net) we have read with all the thrill of a discovery. The variety in each volume is as surprising as the number of volumes. And yet it is the variety of a single theme. Every chapter is a gospel message. How can you say that the repetition of the old, old story is wearisome? The secret is reality and humanity. The men and women and children become known to us and enter the circle of our intimacy. How shall we ever forget old Marjorie or His Worship the Mayor?

They who cannot obtain Lord Charnwood's biography of Lincoln must find and read Mr. J. Alfred Sharp's *Abraham Lincoln* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). Nay, even after Charnwood may come Sharp. For he has his own forcible style and his own grasp of principle. He sees Lincoln with clear eyes and a Christian conscience. The good stories are well told. The man is recognized as indeed, in Lowell's words, 'the first American.'

Note one thing—Lincoln's determination after he had ended the slave trade to end the drink trade also. 'Merwin,' he said, 'we have cleaned up with the help of the people a colossal job. Slavery is abolished. After reconstruction the next great question will be the overthrow and the abolition of the liquor traffic; and you know, Merwin, that my head and heart and hand and purse will go into that work.'

Messrs. Wells Gardner have issued the ninth edition (carefully revised throughout) of Lt.-Col. W. H. Turton's book *The Truth of Christianity* (2s. net).

One of the strongest of the educational movements of our day is toward the study of natural things. Less book more bird, is the demand. And it is so manifestly a right demand that it is irresistible. To give it impetus, L. Beatrice Thompson has written *Just Look! or, How the Children studied Nature* (Gay & Hancock; 5s. net). It is a book, after all, you say? Yes, but it is a book which is to be only a schoolmaster to lead to Nature. The writing is simple and self-effacing. The illustrations are all from the life and most appetizing.

'It is difficult to-day to believe that the fifty-first Psalm, which tells in seventeen verses, of the value of a broken heart before it dares to touch, and then only in two verses, upon the work to be done by holy hearts and hands in building the walls of Jerusalem, can really be a united whole. To-day people only view the walls of Jerusalem and the institutions of the place, and spend all their thought upon them, and, perhaps, would not give even two verses to the right spirit of rebuilding.' So says the Right Rev. Bertram Pollock, C.V.O., D.D., Bishop of Norwich, in his Second Visitation Charge, entitled *The Church To-day* (Norwich: Goose & Son). The Charge dealt with the Failure of the Church, the Criticism of the Church, the Church and the Clergy, the Church and Reform, the Church and the Layman, and the Church and Brotherhood. But the last address has not been included as it was already published in another form. The quotation made above is from the address on Reform.

How difficult it is to recapture the charm of childhood, how pleasant it is when actually recaptured and set out credibly and convincingly. Mr. Sydney Cope Morgan, of Trinity College, Cambridge, has recovered for us Dick and Molly and Dick's sister Mary, and the boy-on-the-other-side-of-the-garden-wall, and they are very childlike and unexpected, and themselves. Mary's prayer that God would give her one of Dick's toys and her confident appropriation of it because God 'said nothing against it'; and Dick's disgust with Mary's momentary goodness, and 'D'you know what I'm going to do? I'm going to ask Him to make me very naughty—and see if it isn't much more fun!' It is all as it has been and is and shall be. The book, *When Leaves were Green* (Heffer; 6s. net), is illustrated by Mrs. Owen Buckmaster.

Dr. R. H. Fisher's book, *The Outside of the Inside* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), is good biography, and it is better homiletics. It will be read widely for its anecdotes, which are many and

amusing. It will be delighted in for its human sympathy and large-heartedness. But it will profit most of all the man who is on the way towards the responsibility of a parish and a pulpit. The wise counsellor to divinity students is proverbially dull. Dr. Fisher could not be dull if he set out to try.

On one page he raises the question of the most important thing in a sermon. With Carlyle he says Belief. And if by Belief Carlyle meant conviction of the truth of the message, the choice is right.

On another page he tells us that once he had to preach to booksellers, and he quotes enough of the sermon to enable us to say that it is a model for a 'special occasion.'

On a third page he gives some examples of big words. He says: 'The big words people sometimes use by preference for simple and intelligible words often cause a smile. A woman said to a minister friend of mine as she went out of the room before him, "You will excuse me predeceasing you, Mr. Davidson": to which he answered, "With all the pleasure in life." It was the same woman who told him that, on the occasion of an unexpected visitor's arrival, she had just "impoverished" a bed in the parlour. A good woman in Aberdeenshire said to me, "Hae ye ever preached in Crathie Kirk, Mr. Fisher? They tell me the agnostics are very bad there." I said, "Dear me, where do they sit?" Some time later, I passed on the story to one of Queen Victoria's ladies (the late Lady Antrim (in the drawing-room at Balmoral She commented, "I suppose they sit in the south transept" (where the seats for the Court are). She then went across the room and told Queen Victoria. But I did not discover whether or not "we were amused." After a burial, before the funeral party scattered, the chief mourner said to a friend of mine, "We've buried her: we took her sister to the creamery."'

In 1912 Mr. Austin Harrison wrote (the article was published in *The English Review*): 'The German opportunity has come, though not by any will of hers; it is a great opportunity, none the less, one which, if taken, she is never likely to regret. All that is necessary is a modification in her shipbuilding programme, which, automatically, would modify ours. No word need be spoken. There is no use in any diplomatic action or contrivance. All that we require to accept her as a friend is the cessation of a wilfully uneconomic race in shipbuilding—a policy which is the direct cause of the present grouping of European power and the reason of so much unwarranted antagonism. A policy of honest friendship with England would at once ease the whole European tension. It is a policy which German politicians in their own despite will immediately have to consider. It is a policy which, if they do not in the near future adopt, will prove to humanity that Germany is indeed the spirit of unrest in the centre of Europe, against which Europe will be forced to provide. In a word, *instead of peace, the Balkan war will be the forerunner of yet another.*'

Mr. Harrison has republished that essay, along with some twenty more, in a volume entitled *Before and Now* (Lane; 6s. 6d. net). It is not the only instance in which he saw beforehand the course of events. We have accordingly good reason for listening to him when (as in the last paper) he tells us how to build for the future. There are, he says, three parties now. First there is the party that would like to leave things as they are. This group 'is probably pretty considerable, comprising in no small part official Party Liberalism and official Party Toryism, supported by the Church and all posts and pillars of individualist, institutional England.' Next there is the commercial party. To them reconstruction is an economic problem. It includes both Capital and Labour. Lastly, there is the spiritual party—'and by spiritual I mean simply the impersonalism of idea together with the means and methods of its application.' This party demands education—new methods in education (the Public School system must go), and new men.

Dr. Thiselton Mark is one of the most courageous of our educational reformers. He is one of the most persuasive also, for he has the use of an expressive English style. His new book *Efficiency Ideals* (Werner Laurie; 2s. 6d. net) goes beyond the school teacher's sphere, and deals with the whole range of industrial life. In one sentence, its aim is to introduce the results of recent psychological study into the workshops. Let every man be sent to the job he is fit for, and let him not be kept at it too long at a stretch. The advantages are set forth with great resource both of instance and argument.

Mr. Werner Laurie has also issued a volume of

Letters to a Young Man on Love and Health (4s. 6d. net). The author is Mr. Walter M. Gallichan.

Under the title of *The New Days* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), the Rev. Edward Shillito has republished some papers which he contributed to the *Westminster Gazette*. They deal, one and all, with urgent questions. Mr. Shillito has lived through the War, and, God willing, will live long after it, but he knows not what a day may bring forth. So he is up and doing and calls on every one of us. The most 'Prophetic' paper is that on 'the Apathy of Good Men'—Curse ye Meroz—and we have a better opportunity of coming to the help of the Lord than Meroz had.

From Theosophy to Christian Faith (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net) is a good guide to a knowledge of theosophic teaching. Miss E. R. McNeile was once one of the initiated. She might be expected to be now a bitter judge, but she is not so. The Society lends itself easily enough to ridicule, but here is serious and restrained criticism. Doctrine after doctrine is taken up and compared with the corresponding doctrine of Christianity. Plainly the author is a theologian; she knows Christian theology as she knows theosophical speculation.

What are the books to read on Theosophy? The easiest two, by theosophists themselves, are *Theosophy* in the 'People's Books' (Jack), by Mrs. Besant, and *An Outline of Theosophy*, by G. W. Leadbeater (Theos. Pub. Co.). An admirable account of the more ambitious and abstruse doctrines is given by Louis Elbé in *Future Life* (Chatto & Windus). The history of the movement will be found in Dr. J. T. Farquhar's *Modern Religious Movements in India* (Macmillan). And now for criticism and comparison take Miss McNeile's book.

We have read many Roman Catholic books on the work of the ministry but have rarely found them helpful. The whole attitude is other than ours. It is therefore both a surprise and a pleasure to come upon a book with the one word *Preaching* as its title and find it easy to read and useful to follow. The author is the Rev. W. B. O'Dowd (Longmans; 6s. net). All the essentials of preaching are touched and nearly always with illumination. Once Mr. O'Dowd does a striking thing. He quotes in succession parts of a sermon from a posthumous volume of Dr. Meynell and parts of a sermon by some unnamed (possibly Anglican) preacher. Both are on Judas. The one shows how imagination may play on such a theme to edification, the other how fancy may surround it with vulgarity.

Who knows about *The Methodist Unitarian Movement*? The Rev. H. McLachlan, M.A., B.D., if no one else. He has given himself to the investigation of it as if there were nothing else on earth worth studying. And he has been able to write a book about it which shows us that, out of the history of the past as well as out of the Bible, God has yet many things to make known to us. Some one will say, Why write so big a book about so obscure and insignificant a sect? To whom the answer is, Read the book. There is revelation of the mind of man that is as useful as the study of a scientific manual of psychology, and much more pleasurable. And there is excellent material for the study of Religion.

Mr. McLachlan is Lecturer in Hellenistic Greek in the University of Manchester, and the book is published in Manchester at the University Press, in London by Messrs. Longmans (4s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Macmillan have issued the fifth edition of *Mendelism*, by Professor R. C. Punnett (7s. 6d. net). Since 1912, the date of issue of the fourth edition, 'the most noteworthy contribution to genetical studies has come from the American school. In the fruit-fly, *Drosophila*, they have found unusually favourable material with which to work, and they have exploited the advantages it offers with energy and acumen. Their object has been to connect the phenomena of heredity with the visible material basis of the chromosomes of the living cell. Indeed, Professor Morgan has declared that, as the result of these researches, the problem of heredity has been solved.' While admitting the very high value and interest of the work, Professor Punnett is not prepared to subscribe to this dictum. He has tried, however, 'to present the position of the supporters of the chromosome theory, in order that those who wish to may make themselves acquainted with what is, at the present moment, the most keenly discussed question in heredity. This has necessitated the addition of two chapters, with a corresponding

increase in the number of Plates and Figures. Several chapters also have been rewritten.'

We used to speak of 'An Introduction to the Bible': the modern title is *A Book about the English Bible* (Macmillan; 10s. net). The author is Josiah H. Penniman, Ph.D., LL.D., Vice-Provost and Professor of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania.

Professor of English Literature—and he writes an introduction to the Bible, not as a layman but as a fully furnished Bible scholar. He speaks of the *English* Bible, but the limiting word does not seem to be called for. His business is with the whole Bible, and he knows his business. Let us quote the titles of some of his chapters: I. The Sources of the English Bible; II. The Background of the Old Testament; III. The Background of the New Testament; IV. Poetic Forms in the Bible; V. The Uses and Sources of Imagery and Allusion in the Bible; VI. Biblical History; VII. Biblical Stories; VIII. The Psalms.

After some more chapters the English Bible comes to the front and the last six deal with it, giving occasion for the word in the title. In the section on Modern Versions special attention is drawn to Dr. Moffatt's translation of the New Testament.

There is a good deal of original work in the book in spite of the width of the field and the way it has been explored already. In Ecclesiastes, Dr. Penniman recognizes the use of the scientific method—a rarity in Hebrew literature. Koheleth 'does not simply make a general statement and then try to prove it. He states what he believes to be facts, and from them, by induction, endeavours to derive a general proposition. Beginning with some general statements concerning human life, 1^{1-11}, he proceeds to tell us of certain experiments he made by devoting himself to the pursuit successively of wisdom, mirth, wine, houses and vineyards, forests, great possessions, singers, musicians, whatsoever the eyes desired. All proved to be "vanity and a striving after wind," 2^{26}. Having failed to find satisfaction in his experiments, he then turned to observation of nature, and of men, individually and collectively. He reached some conclusions, which he states, without however being able to solve at all the mystery of the inequalities and apparent injustice, which he observes among men.'

The *Dublin Essays* of Arthur Clery (Maunsel; 4s. 6d. net) are so plainly written by an Irishman for Irishmen that it is of the utmost use to read them. Mr. Clery is not a politician, he is just an Irishman. He is a Roman Catholic certainly, and in one of his short essays he expresses the fear that 'that last bulwark of Irish independence' is in danger of being swept away. His fear comes from France. 'If France were to go into schism, for instance, a thing never wholly off the cards.' But it is just as an Irishman who can write that you will find Mr. Clery worth reading. For you must add your weight to the movement, now at last on the way, of giving Ireland political peace; and you cannot do so helpfully unless you understand the Irishman. There are many topics touched in the volume and many acute remarks made—not of the bull order but of the native quickness of discernment—like this: 'In all Irish morality, "don'ts" figure much more largely than "do's".'

He is not a politician, but he looks on. For the last hundred years, he says, 'three main policies have been advocated by different parties:

(1) To drive the English out of Ireland.
(2) To drive the Protestants out of Ireland.
(3) To drive everybody out of Ireland.

'The three policies have flourished under different names at different times. And at all times they have been more practised than avowed, but in the terminology of our own time, they correspond very roughly to

(1) Sinn Féin.
(2) "The Constitutional Movement."
(3) Unionism.'

The Right Rev. Frank Weston, D.D., Bishop of Zanzibar, has written 'an open pastoral letter to the European Missionaries of his Diocese,' and has published it under the title of *The Christ and His Critics* (Mowbray; 6s. net). Two enemies are in the way, Romanism and (theological) Liberalism. Dr. Weston disposes of Romanism in one short chapter: it is Liberalism that occupies his mind and his book.

Kikuyu began it; the consecration of Dr. Henson as Bishop of Hereford completed the offence. Dr. Weston uttered his protest publicly at the time of the consecration: in this volume he tells us why. Dr. Henson disbelieves certain

articles in the Creed and doubts others—the Virgin Birth, the bodily Resurrection, and the Inerrancy are specially named. The Bishop of Zanzibar dislikes the methods by which these parts of the Creed are questioned; he detests the result of the methods. It is the abuse of the scientific method that has wrought all the mischief. For himself, he is satisfied that the Christ of orthodoxy is protected by the threefold cord of Tradition, the Gospels, and the Creed. In the end of the book he asks the Bishop of Hereford and certain others how often they declare, in their daily worship, their belief in the Virgin Birth, and what they mean when they do.

We have read the criticisms of the men on the Church and its failure, let us hear a woman now. Miss Edith Picton-Turbervill, O.B.E., who along with Canon Streeter edited *Woman and the Church*, has written *Musings of a Laywoman on the Life of the Churches* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). Among other impressions she is much impressed with the poverty of preaching in the Church of England, to which she belongs and to which she is much attached. And yet she is very sure that preaching is the great instrument. 'Could not the Church see its way to having an Order of Preachers, both men and women?'

Mr. Coulson Kernahan has written an account of his experience among the spiritualists. He calls his book simply *Spiritualism* (R.T.S.; 1s. net). He says: 'Claiming as it does to be a great movement, the surprising thing about modern spiritualism is that it has no literature worthy of the name. Swedenborgianism and mysticism have their great exponents in both poetry and prose. Spiritualism has not added a line to what is accounted literature. Even the few distinguished men and women of letters who have joined its ranks seem, when they write on spiritualism, to be other and less than themselves. The most surprising "discovery," the only discovery that recent spiritualism has made, is the "discovery" of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Sir Oliver Lodge as spiritualists!'

The Rev. S. Harvey Gem's Addresses for Special Days are uncommonly good examples of what such addresses should be. They are so good that they had better be laid aside after reading. But they had better be read. They open up possibilities at Harvest Thanksgivings and the like that may never have been realized yet. The title is *Parochial Occasions* (Scott; 3s. net).

The Rev. Henry Phipps Denison, B.A., Prebendary of Wells, is an outspoken, sometimes alarming, exponent of popular High Church doctrine. In *The Blessed Sacrament* (Scott; 2s. 6d. net) he declares the faith as to the Real Presence. He is as emphatic as any Roman on the literal meaning of the verb in 'This is my body,' and is not at all disturbed by the fact that at the moment Christ's body was at the table, not on it. He says that when Christ spoke these words the bread lost its own qualities as bread and 'took over' the qualities of a human body.

The Rev. N. Green-Armytage, M.A., late Incumbent of S. Aidan's, Boston, Lincs., has written a Foreword to Mr. A. A. Parker's *A Simple History of the English Church* (Scott; 3s. 6d. net) in which he estimates the gains and the losses of the Reformation. The gains are (1) the dismissal of the one-man rule of the papacy; (2) the restoration of the chalice to the faithful at Holy Communion; (3) a vernacular liturgy; (4) the Bible in the common tongue and a recommendation that it be read both publicly and in the home; and (5) the abolition of compulsory celibacy of the clergy. What are the losses? With the best will in the world Mr. Green-Armytage can discover only these two: the cessation of Eucharistic privileges and the secularization of the monastic and chantry funds.

The History is not exactly exhilarating reading—Mr. Parker's style is a trifle dry—but it is both reasonable and reliable.

To the 'Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice,' edited by Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, the editor himself has added a volume on *Broad Church Theology* (Scott; 3s. 6d. net). According to Dr. Sparrow Simpson's classification, English Churchmen are of three schools — Evangelical, Catholic, and Broad. He is himself a Catholic. He here seeks to show that the Broad Churchmen are faithless to the traditional theology of the Church and sometimes to common sense. The best part of the book is the exposition of what is involved for religion in the doctrine of Christ's

pre-existence. Belief in Christ's pre-existence enables us to understand the love of God; it calls forth our response to that love; it deepens our horror of sin; it is essential to the worship of Christ; it is fundamental to Christian morals; it is the final argument for Christian generosity.

How the dogma of the Real Presence is defended, with all that follows from it, by an Anglican priest, may be seen in a book called *The Counter-Reformation in the Church of England* (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net). It has been written (as an open letter to the Bishop of Manchester) by the Rev. Spencer Jones, Rector of Batsford with Moreton-in-Marsh.

The Rev. John P. Kingsland preaches a sermon with plenty of matter in it. It is the best sermon, if it is well arranged and simply worded, as is every one of the sermons in *Visions of God* (Skeffingtons; 5s. net). The texts are for the most part well worn, but they will endure much handling yet. 'God is light'—there is a sermon for you—as original as any sermon ought to be, filled with the good things of the grace of God, appealing to every part of the person (intellect, emotions, will) and to every person in the congregation.

With the title of *Right and Wrong after the War* (5s. net), Messrs. Skeffington have published an able and enterprising study of Christian morality in the light of modern social problems. The author is Bernard Iddings Bell, Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral Church, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin.

An early note suggests freedom of speech. 'At a recent Church congress a woman who teaches in one of our great colleges visited a fort with a number of the clergy. She looked at the great guns with a pacifist's dislike, and finally said, "I wonder what the Apostles would have said at the sight of those guns." Thereupon one of the clergy promptly rejoined, "They would have said nothing of any particular importance." The professor was much shocked; but the answer was profoundly true. The sociology of the Apostles is, fortunately, not binding upon the Church. As a theologian, for instance, St. Paul is an immortal leader. A good part of his sociology, including his solemn pronouncements about the proper place of women in the world, to-day is simply bosh.'

Topic after topic, and just those topics which most demand discussion—Poverty, Feminism, Housing, Drinking, Sexual Vice, Sport, Patriotism, Internationalism—topic after topic is discussed with understanding and with courage. Allow the word just quoted; not another regrettable word is uttered. All is spoken under a high sense of responsibility, 'as ever in the great Taskmaster's eye.'

Mr. W. P. Young, M.A., M.C., D.C.M., has written one of the most telling books which the fertile idea of Reconstruction has brought forth. It is as *A Soldier to the Church* that he writes (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). And his complaint—for he has one supreme complaint to make—is that the Church did not send her young men out of their parishes into the fighting line. But he shows the Church what can still be done. 'We want two things,' he says—'a fresh ideal of life which shall comprehend and develop all the finer things we have discovered in common life, and a life free enough and wide enough in which to cultivate our greatest gift from the war—ourselves.'

'More than a year ago the Interdenominational Conference of Social Service Unions published "a Statement of Principles and Proposals" on "Christian Social Reconstruction." This Statement has received a wide welcome and been found both stimulating and instructive. But, especially when taken as a subject for study circles, it has been found to need a commentary much less brief and summary than a leaflet. Such a commentary must necessarily be by an individual: and the individual only must be responsible for it. I am sure this little book by Mr. Will Reason will serve its purpose as a commentary on our statement, and will assist individuals and study circles both by way of stimulus and by way of instruction; and I have no hesitation in commending it heartily to the attention of those whom we can reach, at a moment when everyone, who has a heart to feel or a brain to think, knows that he must instruct himself to help along right roads and to inspire with right ideals the reconstruction of our industrial life.'

That Foreword to Mr. Reason's book, *Christianity and Social Renewal* (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net), is signed by Bishop Gore. What further word is needed? Yet we have read the book and could say pleasant things about it.

A pamphlet, scientific and wholesome, on spiritual healing, has been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The title is *Suggestions on Health and Healing* (4d. net).

The latest addition to the S.P.C.K. 'Helps for Students of History' is *An Introduction to the History of American Diplomacy*, by Carl Russell Fish, Ph.D., Professor of American History in the University of Wisconsin (1s. net).

The war has made the matter of sexual indulgence the first of our urgent problems. And it is the most difficult. But we have at last obtained one important thing. We have received the right book to work with. *A Corner-Stone of Reconstruction* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net) has been written by four chaplains—the Rev. Barten W. Allen (Ch. of Eng.), the Rev. A. Herbert Gray (Pres.), the Rev. Joseph Wallett (United Board), and the Rev. J. Clark Gibson (Wes.). It has been written for the worker and contains four specimen lectures to men. But it is good also for the men themselves—to have by them, to read as they feel inclined or are conscience-driven, and to obey. How rarely can one recommend a book on chastity: this book may be recommended with absolute confidence.

In the free and easy discussion of the Church which goes on at present, is it not sometimes forgotten that the Church is the Body of Christ? And when that is remembered, is it not sometimes forgotten that it is a living body? There it is, the Body of Christ, of which we are members in particular—with all the responsibility of such membership. But there also is the Holy Spirit of God, informing it, giving it life, enabling it to fulfil its purpose in the world. If the truth of the indwelling spirit has been forgotten read *The Holy Spirit's Work in the Holy Catholic Church*, by H. Maynard Smith (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 3d. net).

It is just ten years since the Rev. W. Y. Fausset produced the Cambridge edition of Novatian's De Trinitate. Now Mr. Herbert Moore, M.A., has translated the work and issued it with a useful and quite comprehensible Introduction. The title is *The Treatise of Novatian on the Trinity* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). Some one said quite recently (was it the Dean of St. Paul's?) that in the near future the doctrine of the Trinity will be the chief subject of theological discussion. He said further that it would come out of the discussion an uninjured and progressive truth. If that is so, let us begin early and study Novatian. He is a fine example of that method of interpretation which finds Christ in every text of the Old Testament.

The Sunday School Union has issued its Lesson Helps for the year 1920. They consist of (1) *Notes on the Scripture Lesson*, a handsome illustrated octavo volume, containing subject-studies for seniors, the British International Lessons and the Primary Lessons—all thoroughly explained and illustrated; (2) *The International Lesson Pocket Notes* (1s. 6d. net)—a convenient summary of the results of good scholarship, written by W. D. Bavin; (3) *Notes on the Morning Lessons* (1s. 6d. net), by J. Eaton Feasey—the work of a most competent and experienced teacher who knows how to adapt the lesson to the learner.

From the Sunday School Union there comes another book of unexpected freshness. It is an account, part historical and part geographical, of *The Lands behind the Bible Story* (3s. 6d. net). All the countries which are travelled by the Bible adventures from Abraham to Paul are popularly, almost poetically, described; and yet it is the description of a modern scientific geographer, H. H. Swinnerton, D.Sc., F.G.S., F.Z.S.

In this book on *The Relation of Custom to Law* (Sweet & Maxwell; 7s. 6d. net), Mr. Gilbert T. Sadler, M.A., LL.B., shows how social customs have arisen and how they have been transformed into laws. 'Customs,' he says, 'have arisen in two ways: either by a people repeating certain acts (as the use of a footpath) till they become habitual, or by some popular authority making decisions on cases voluntarily brought before him.' Then these customs were by some later authority declared to be laws binding on the community. Thus 'the Roman Laws of the Twelve Tables (B.C. 451) point to a previous period in which the rules adopted in that Code were largely acted on as customs among the Roman people.' The point is that laws are not arbitrary enactments; they are first customs and then rules willingly accepted for self-preservation and the better government of the community. 'Well might Tacitus speak of kings who persuaded rather than commanded men.

Such customs rested on the social sanction of exclusion from society, or on a sanction of self-help, as in the case of a thief or debtor. In Rome, laws could even be repealed by the "tacit disuse of the people."'

The R.P.A. Annual for 1920 (Watts; 1s. net) contains contributions by Professor J. B. Bury, Litt.D., Eden Phillpotts, William Archer, and others. Professor Bury's contribution comes early—no doubt on account of his eminence. But it is the weakest article in the Annual. What he seems to wish to say is that Religion is nothing to him and Rationalism is no more. Mr. McCabe's article on 'The Churches and the World-Unrest' is the most serious contribution to the volume. It is well filled with misunderstandings, but it is at any rate the work of a believer in his own unbelief. An article by 'a clergyman of the Church of England' ends in this way: 'The present writer confesses that, lacking a belief in miracles, he can see no sign of the emancipation of free-thinkers in the Church. Hence, the man who is free will be well advised to avoid Holy Orders. The man who has won his freedom since ordination will doubtless take the first opportunity to escape from the ministry, if he can enter another profession. Otherwise he must stay in the house of bondage where the Church pays intellectual prostitutes to minister to the needs of the faithful. He is fed indeed, and enjoys a certain leisure; but his soul longs continually for a free man's life.' Did the editor accidentally omit the word 'former' before 'clergyman'?

Christ and the Will.

By the Reverend Arthur C. Hill, Glasgow.

Where certitude is possible men ought to seek for it. That is a proposition hardly any one would think of denying. If there be a truth anywhere corresponding to our intelligence, framed to our mind, we should pursue it. All men who work at the unveiling of Nature's secrets have accepted this binding rule. Of course one assumes that the truth is of some importance, that it has relation to life, to our interests as men. There are facts, plenty of them, which, interesting enough to the specialist, yet are scarcely to be regarded as of first importance for other people. The number of the known stars, the cubic measurement of Lake Leman, the date of the battle of Chaeronea, are all more or less ascertainable and interesting facts; but they are not vital, do not affect the life of men. When we say that men ought to seek truths, to find certitude where possible, we speak of those things that are really important to their welfare. Jesus believed this. On more than one occasion He enforced the duty of seeking for this certainty. Nor is He hesitant about the nature of the truth to be sought. A sufficient knowledge of the divine nature to save us from crude mistakes, a fairly clear understanding of our own place in the world as men, what we are, and the manner in which we ought to act if we are to live up to our privileges, and some apprehension of the part that Christ Himself ought to play in a well-ordered human life, these are some of the themes on which Jesus believed that certitude could be found and should be sought. The certitude will be one of experience, demonstrable to oneself but not necessarily provable to others; but it will not the less be certitude, having a working value for its owner.

In counselling men on this matter Jesus presses His authority on the will. We might have expected that He would have spoken of some intellectual gnosis, some opening of the mind through which the splendour of the world, of God, of man, might enter. Something of this is implied in His speech, but His main attack, so to speak, is directed against the fortress of human personality, the will itself. 'He that willeth to do shall know.' No one has recognized more generously than Jesus the vast coiled power of the human will, whether it be called on to achieve or to endure. Not thinking of it so much as a separate faculty, something quite detachable from reflexion or desire, but seeing in it the concentrated essence of the whole personality, it is there that He seeks to win

men, to subdue them to His own gracious purpose. To induce men to will boldly, that is to touch the cap of the explosive shell, to release all the latest energies of our nature. He makes equally clear the object to which the will of man is to be directed. To know God's will, to understand and obey the law, that is the purpose of all profitable labour.

Is not Jesus here describing the one method by which men may make themselves masters of unknown realms, whether they be explorers of the earth's surface, or readers in the library of life? For to will the possession of something, is it not already to have half accomplished the self-appointed task? You are content to bend your mind to the subject. All thought of resentment against the indignities and pains of apprenticeship is forgotten, you do as you are commanded by the person who knows, without questioning whether his judgment might not be improved on by some apt remark from your own stores of wisdom. Loyola in middle age taking his seat by the side of juvenile scholars, Kipling's American boy accepting his place amongst the Newfoundland fishermen who have picked him up, the greenhorn in a Texas ranch, learning the ways of the country from the rough tongues and sometimes rougher fists of his new companions—do they not all discover that to will to know is more than half the battle? But it is in the religious life that the truth of Christ's words is most apparent. For there it is only the obedient mind, the teachable spirit, that will carry any man over the pitfalls and precipices waiting for his feet. If we were to try, daringly enough, to expand this pregnant saying of Jesus, would it not take such form as this?—'Make your object, the purpose towards which your will is directed, perfectly clear in your own mind. Know what you want.' Much of our religious disaffection has no deeper origin than this, the unwillingness of men to clarify their own minds on the subject. Uncertain what they expect from religion, they seek and may not find, because they have not clearly told themselves what they are seeking for. Long views are said to be bad for politics, but they are certainly good for those who wish to have clear ideas about life. The gospel picture of Nicodemus is that of a man who had definite ideas of what he wanted, who sought out Jesus because that great Rabbi seemed the most likely person to give him illumination.

There is, however, a feeling amongst men that religion, especially religious belief, the great affirmation of the soul, ought to be kept apart from all interference by the volitional, the willing, element in man. It is something purely mental, on which no decision should be made until the evidence is so overwhelming that denial is impossible. That is not the way of the gospel, nor is it the way of men in their dealings with common affairs. Not because we know everything that we should like to know about a man do we trust him, not on pure information alone do we act in the hours of grave decision. When things are equally balanced, when the evidence is incomplete but the decision is imperative, we take sides, we judge, and approve or repudiate, throwing the weight of our will into the scale, moving forward where, if we waited for absolute conviction, we should never move at all. And the common sense of the world has declared that this is the better way. Would not Jesus also suggest that the will has its part to play in the creation of habitudes, if our devotion to the good, the true, is to be manifested in any serviceable fashion? Men do not grow into saintliness by accident, but by willing to be saintly. The wood of the violin absorbs some subtle influence from the playing of a competent performer, so that, as it ages, its tones grow richer, mellower, responding more truly and sweetly to the touch of the master's hand. The conjurer will train himself to read aloud from a printed book whilst keeping four balls moving in the air. What a will to succeed must be there before that can be accomplished! That is why Jesus would say, 'Will yourself into line with the good, drive furrows in the matter of the brain until the difficult, the impossible, becomes easy to you as breathing.'

And in the service that we render to God, whether it be the attacking of evil, old and hoary sins, or in the defence of the good, the counsel of Jesus would be 'Seize the occasion. Bind yourself by a resolve, and make the high hour of your resolution a peak from which you may leap forward to something higher still.' To think, meditate, reflect over your act, that is good counsel for all. But reflexion will not bring you far along the road unless you fix the fruit of your cogitations in some overt deed, some act which defines your attitude towards the world. And to act is an exercise of will. 'If you fear your vow,' said Gregory the IXth to Clare, one of his spiritual children, 'we will release you.' But Clare knew better. Her vow placed her in a declared position, liberated her

from indecision, and enabled her to know the truth by putting her in the path where it may be found. All men of character have known this. They have pondered long over life's problems, but the time to decide has come to them, and they have willed themselves into agreement with the powers that illuminate and inspire the soul. That was the meaning of the old viking's vow, 'I am thy man.' It gave to the wandering seaman a captain, a place in a regiment, a standing in his world. It is what Jesus would have men do. Will to act in agreement with truth, with God, and truth and God shall be known, the realities that lie deeper than the base of the everlasting hills.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.'—Mt 5^8.

There is a certain little village in France called Domrémy that is famous because a wonderful young girl was born there. It is an old story; for it was on a January morning as long ago as 1412 that she first saw the light. And she certainly opened her eyes on a lovely spot. There was a winding river near her father's house and a fountain which was on the brink of a great forest. This forest was a wonderfully mysterious place. It was haunted by fairies to such a degree that the parish priest used to read Mass there once a year to frighten them. But little Jeanne, as her father and mother named her at baptism, was never frightened one bit. There were times, indeed, when she wandered about in the woods by herself, hoping all the time that she would meet a fairy.

When the apple trees were in bloom, and the air was soft and warm, then the thought of fairies would grow into a thought of God, and she said the prayers that her mother taught her. It was as if angels and not fairies came round her. Jeanne was a good little girl; she had a pure heart. In the woods she often seemed to get away into the world that cannot be seen with our bodily eyes. Do you wonder, when Jesus Himself said, 'Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.'

Not only did Jeanne feel quite sure that she saw the angels, she heard voices, and one voice said, 'Little Jeanne, be good and God will aid thee.'

Her home was a very simple one. Her father Jacques d'Arc and his wife Isabeau were just plain hard-working people. The mother was a deeply religious woman. It was she who taught the little girl to pray, and told her stories which Jeanne liked even better than fairy tales. These were about the Saints, for both the father and mother were Catholics. Though Jeanne could neither read nor write, she was quick to understand and to sympathize. As she listened to her mother's stories, she wept at the sorrows of the holy men and women, and she laughed when she felt they had cause to be happy.

By and by, Jeanne became a shepherdess. Her father had flocks of sheep, and being only a peasant farmer he could not afford to pay outside help, so his little daughter was sent out to tend them. When she was not herding the sheep, she would be spinning beside her mother and sister in the garden or in the house. One can picture the group. While little Jeanne kept busy with her hands, her eyes told of thoughts that were far away from Domrémy. She was thinking of her mother's stories, which she went on relating to the whirring accompaniment of the spinning wheels. Jeanne loved no story better than that of the Maid Margaret, the maiden who had walked barefooted in the meadows watching her sheep, and who afterwards died a martyr's death because she would not deny her Lord. She thought of Maid Margaret as she tended her father's sheep, and when she lay in her little bed at night.

But although Domrémy was just a little country village that lay on the borders of a great forest where fairies walk, it was not quite cut off from the great world. There were cross-roads near Jacques d'Arc's house. One of these roads was the great highway between France and Germany; so there were always people passing—wayfarers, we might call them—who brought the news to Jacques d'Arc and his wife Isabeau. Jeanne listened you may

be sure. She knew all about the great battle of Agincourt. Every French peasant was aware that his country had fallen on evil days. After constant fighting for about thirteen years, and having been conquered again and again by the English, the people of France were in despair. They hated England; they thought her a cruel tyrant; but though the simple French folk had the spirit of Scottish highlanders they had become too weak to fight with any spirit. Jeanne, now grown to be a young girl, was sensitive as ever to the voices of the forest. But if in the summer woods she heard music that sounded like a great *Te Deum*, from the cross-roads there came martial strains calling her to battle. And an angel presence made the strains like a glorious battle hymn. Jeanne felt sure that the angel was St. Michael, the warrior archangel about whom her mother had told her. He had in his hand a shining sword, a crown upon his head, and wings folded about him.

'Little Jeanne,' he said, 'it is thou who must go to the help of the King of France; it is thou who must give him back his kingdom.' For five years he kept calling gently but persistently Jeanne, the shepherdess of Domrémy, and she pondered over his message. Her thoughts became wings, until at length she could hold back no longer. There had been other influences than that of St. Michael at work; her mother had trained her from childhood to think of these things; the forest also, with the fountain near it, had played its part, but most powerful influence of all was the voice of God in Jeanne's own heart.

Jeanne went. She presented herself before the Dauphin of France. At first he felt inclined to be amused, but after a bit he resolved to give her mission a trial. She had not a long career 'at the front' as we say; but now, after 500 years, the story of those few months makes the world marvel. She succeeded in setting the Dauphin upon the throne, not by her strength but by the wonderful influence of her presence. For although the soldiers she commanded, like the Dauphin, were at first inclined to ridicule the idea of a mere girl leading them to battle, soon they were fighting as they never fought in their lives. By her mere purity and goodness they became convinced that she had been raised up to deliver their beloved France. They learned to feel shame for all foul speech and foul thought, and followed her as a leader sent from Heaven.

But with Jeanne, it was not as with our great generals. She was never hailed as a heroine for what she had done. She had no wish to be. In fighting she was but obeying the voice of God; and instead of harbouring evil thoughts against the English, it is said that she sent a touching invitation to their leaders to unite with the French in a crusade against infidelity. When reverses came, and it was evident that her work was done, she wept, for she was weary and sad. Then a picture of her dear old home rose before her, and she prayed to God that she might be allowed to go back there and be a shepherdess once more. She remembered the angels of the forest. Doesn't it remind you of how after his battles King David longed to get a drink of water from the well of Bethlehem?

But to Jeanne there only came suffering. After being wounded several times, she was at length betrayed by some of her own countrymen, who handed her over to the English. They, with eyes that saw not as Jeanne saw, believed her to be a witch. That meant prison, and in the end death. Jeanne was burned alive by the English in the market-place of Rouen. To-day we should be ashamed to tell the story did we not believe that nations, like boys and girls and men and women, learn by making mistakes and suffering for them.

What seemed a cruel tragedy turned into glory. We are told that ten thousand men wept the day Jeanne, the Maid of Orleans, gave up her life, and that a soldier who threw a faggot on the scaffold because he had sworn to do it, turned away a penitent for life, saying that he had seen a dove rising upon wings to heaven from her ashes.

The story of Jeanne d'Arc, or Joan of Arc, as I dare say you boys and girls call her, is one of the loveliest stories of girlhood ever told. To-day her influence in France is stronger than ever it has been. On the night that the Germans were nearest Paris and were turned back, the French password was Jeanne d'Arc, and thousands of French peasants believe that the maid appeared once more to save her country.

There are little girls like Jeanne amongst us still. I knew one. When she went to school and had learned to read and write, she was asked to write an essay giving an account of how she spent her summer days at home. 'I remember the evenings best,' she wrote. 'Father is a shoemaker, and when the newspaper came to the workshop, it was

read aloud and the workmen applauded or hissed the men who made the speeches in parliament. It was like being at a big meeting. But sometimes I grew tired listening; then I went out to the garden to look for fairies in the hearts of the flowers.' This girl became a nurse-maid. When I last saw her she was reading a paper at a literary society. Every one kept very still while she read, for it was as if she had seen visions that much more learned people than she was might envy.

Boys see visions and hear voices too. The story of the war is far from being entirely a story of horrors and sadness. It was made glorious by the great army of the 'pure in heart,' many of whom gave up their lives because of the visions that had come to them. 'Their name liveth for evermore.' To you boys and girls here there comes the chance of living in a wonderful age. You have days of making great resolves—days of having visions though you will scarcely believe it. Ask God's help to keep hold of these resolves, these visions; so will you have your share in making the world better.

The Biggest Lesson.

'If I . . . know all mysteries and all knowledge . . . but have not love, I am nothing.'—1 Co 13^2.

If I were to ask each of you this morning, 'Why do you go to school?' I wonder what answers I should receive. I expect most of you would at once reply, 'To learn lessons.' Some of you might answer, 'To learn as little as I possibly can,' and a few might say, 'To play.'

But now I shall tell you the real reason why you go to school? It is to make you into useful and helpful men and women. If you haven't learned that, your knowledge will just be a sort of empty ornament. And what is the key to being the best and most useful men and women? It is just one small word of four letters—Love.

St. Paul once wrote a letter to the Christians in Corinth about this very subject. They had been quarrelling amongst themselves as to who had the greatest gift and who should have the place of honour. Those who prophesied said they were the cleverest, but those who did miracles thought they were of more importance, and those who were eloquent, or learned, or knew many languages, claimed to be the wisest, and so on. Their quarrels had led to a great deal of ill-feeling, and envy, and boasting, and pride. And whilst they were squabbling they forgot that the greatest gift the Christian can have is love. That was the biggest lesson the Corinthians had to learn, and they scarcely knew the A B C of it. And Paul told them that, although the other gifts were all good, if they had them all and lacked love they were nothing.

So though you are top of your class in history and geography and arithmetic and science, though you know all the languages dead or alive, and have not love, you are nothing. If you carry off the first prize in everything and are unkind or unjust towards your companions, you count for nothing, and less than nothing.

1. Knowledge is no good unless you can learn to love the boy or girl who won the prize you worked for and missed. To walk up to that boy or girl and shake hands and congratulate them and to do it with a smile, while you choke back the feelings of envy that hurt, that is true pluck and true Christianity. And that is one of the hardest lessons we have to learn not only at school but all through life. If your years at school have taught you that, they have not been spent in vain.

2. Knowledge is not much good unless you can learn to love the person who has done you harm. There is a story told of a great American, General Grant, who commanded the Northern army in the the American Civil War and afterwards became President of the United States. One day some one asked him his opinion of a certain officer in his army. General Grant spoke of this man in the warmest terms, and the questioner exclaimed, 'But do you know that he said this and that of you?' 'Sir,' was the reply, 'you asked me my opinion of him, not his of me.'

To have a heart that cherishes no malice, a mind that is above resenting slights, that is better than all knowledge. It is the most difficult lesson of all. Some of us who are grown-up haven't learned it yet, and we have been trying to learn it all our lives.

3. Knowledge is of little use unless you can love the person who is disagreeable or unattractive. It is easy enough to love some people—those who are pleasant, or beautiful, or kind. But there are others who have come into the world with a twist in their faces or their characters. They are plain, or stupid, or shy, or awkward in their manner, perhaps they are even disagreeable and unkind. Possibly you know a few at your own school—boys

or girls whom nobody wants to love and nobody seems to want to make friends with.

Now there is an eastern proverb which says, 'Through Love bits of copper are made gold.' And there is no saying what we may do to these unattractive people just by loving them. Perhaps it is because they have never been loved enough that they are unattractive, and by loving them we may turn copper into gold.

Do you want to make the world better and happier? Then love. We can never love too much, we may often love too little. Love people who are unattractive. That is what Jesus does. He loves you and me. Jesus loves, and He is going to love the world good.

We can't all be rich, we can't all be clever, we can't all be beautiful, but we can all love. Don't you think that is a grand lesson? Don't you think it is a lesson worth learning?

Written in Ink.

'Paper and ink.'—2 Jn [12].

Do you remember the very first time you tried to write in ink? You had never been allowed to use anything but pencil, but one day mother said you might use a pen and ink. Wasn't it glorious—and messy? And didn't you feel grown-up all in a minute because you were old enough to write in ink?

Well, here is a story about writing in ink, and though the rest of the sermon is for older boys and girls, even the tiny ones may understand the story.

There were once two little maidens named Nancy and Peggy. Nancy was four and Peggy was three. Nancy was a very smart little woman for her age. She knew already all the letters of the alphabet—the great printed capitals, the little printed letters, and even the written letters like those in copybooks. She knew them all by sight, but she could write only a few of them. She was sadly puzzled, for instance, by the written letter 'e.' She had diligently licked her pencil and covered sheet after sheet of paper with attempts at 'e,' but without success. Where she always failed was this. She started all right, but when she came to the loop of the letter instead of going up the right side of the loop, coming back down the left, and then crossing the first line, she went up the left side of the loop then tried to come down the right and make it join neatly at the crossing.

One day Mother was ill, and Auntie, who was in charge, left Nancy and Peggy alone in the sitting-room. By and by they grew tired of playing with their toys and looked for some other amusement. Presently Nancy spied the ink-bottle on the top of Father's desk. Beside it lay paper and pens and a blotting-pad. Ink was forbidden; but here was an opportunity not to be lost. She climbed on a chair, carefully lifted the writing things down and brought them to the table. Then she drew in chairs for Peggy and herself and opened the blotting-pad. What do you think she saw? Why a whole row of 'e's' which somebody had scribbled on the blotting-paper. And suddenly it dawned on Nancy how they were made. 'Oh, Peggy,' she cried, 'watch me make 'e's'! She had no idea how to hold a pen, but Peggy thought you used it like a spoon, so she scooped up penful after penful of ink, and Nancy took each from her and made a few shaky-looking 'e's' and several dozen blots on the paper. And they both gave the table-cloth and their hands and faces a liberal dose of blue-black ink, and then—Auntie came back. You can guess the rest of the story.

Now, boys and girls, God gives us our life like a clean white sheet of paper, but the writing on it is ours. When you are very tiny the things you do seem to be written in pencil. You do what Mother or Nurse or Auntie tells you to do or not to do. If you are naughty or disobedient you get a whipping, or are put in the corner, or are sent to bed early; and somehow the punishment seems to rub out the naughty deed you had written on life's paper.

But a day comes when you no longer write life's doings in pencil. You write them in ink. You no longer do what some one else suggests. You think and act for yourselves. You wake one day to the fact that you are your own master, you can make your own life. You have learnt how to write 'e's.' You are using ink, and the old days of pencil are left behind. There is no more rubbing out now of what you write; once written, it remains for ever.

Now, how are you going to write on life's paper? Are you going to write your story so that at the end you can feel proud of it? Or are you going to make it a blurred mess?—the ink there sure enough, but all in the wrong place; blots and smudges everywhere; the writing slanting now to the right now to the left, now jumping above the

line now dipping below it, what might have been a fair page, ruined; and no hope of making it better! for no eraser, however wonderful, can rub out the mistakes once we have written them.

No, we can never re-write what once is written. But we can do this—we can try to write the lines in front of us better and more carefully. We have always the chance to make the present and the future nobler than the past.

Yes, and we have this too for encouragement. God is also writing on our page of life. Side by side with ours His writing runs. We do not see it now, but one day, when every one's writing is being judged by Him, and we are feeling particularly ashamed of our blotted records, He will tell us to look at them again. And when we look we shall find that the writing we did has vanished, and instead of it there is on the paper God's record of our life. Where we saw only a blot and a failure God has written that we succeeded though we never knew it. Where we saw a desperately uneven line, He has said that the unevenness was there because we were trying so hard to keep to the line and do the right. As for some of the bits of which we were proudest!—God's record may tell us that there we did no great thing, for we wrote it so not for His sake, but that it might look well in the sight of our fellow-men.

Use your ink wisely, boys and girls; write each letter of life's story as in God's sight, and to please Him. Then you need not fear when at the last you lay your written sheets before Him.

The Christian Year.

Second Sunday in Epiphany.

The Gifts of God.

'Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee.'—Acts 3[6].

Peter and John were full of their new power, and the mystery of their new life stretched out before them, but they did not forget the temple at the hour of prayer.

As they passed through the crowd that was always gathered there, at the door there sat a crippled beggar. He asked Peter and John for charity. They gave him no money; they had none to give him. They were as destitute of the one thing on which his heart was set as he was. Silver and gold they had none. But they had something better. Full of the spirit and the health of Christ they had the power of giving health to him, and Peter took the cripple by the hand and lifted him up, and his feet and ankle bones received strength, and he, leaping up, stood and walked and entered into the temple, walking and leaping and praising God. Little did the beggar think that morning as he left his house and crawled up to the temple of what was coming to him before the night closed in. To gather a few pennies as on other begging days was all he hoped for; but to come back home a straight, strong man, this he never pictured to himself.

If, some day, we find we have no silver and gold, then let us go down to the Beautiful Gate of the Temple and work some simple miracle. We can help some lame man; we can read to some blind man; we can comfort and strengthen; we can bless; and even wanting many things which might be of service, we can do those larger things which Christ has told us of, saying, 'The works that I do shall ye do; and greater works than these.' Let us not forget that this incident at the Temple was but the picture of His life. Silver and gold Christ had none. In not one instance in the gospel did He give this kind of help, but He gave men strength and comfort and eternal life. One thing He always had, and He gave that. That one thing every man has, and, whatever be his property, every man, like Christ, can give—himself. And no man is poor who has himself to give.[1]

1. Now we all know that the best help that has been given to us in life has not come from those who gave us money or anything which money could represent. Prominent as money stands in all our thoughts of charity, we owe more to-day to those who have never given us, perhaps who never could have given us, a penny, but who have given us something that is far more valuable than money—the Peters and the Johns who in some need have said to us as we looked up to them, 'Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee,' and who then have touched some dead and withered part of our nature and by their strong character given it back its strength.

Faculty is the true wealth of man. There is many a poor workman who trudges to his work at sunrise who has a pure joy in beholding the pomp and glow of the eastern heavens, hearing the lark's glad carol, and bathing his brow and breast in the clear morning air, such as Dives never knows through a long lifetime, and would give any price to enjoy. But gold cannot buy that. The joy of a healthy, vigorous faculty in the beauty and riches of God's world, of

[1] A. MacKenzie, in *The Culture of Christian Manhood*, 45 (ed. W. H. Sallmon).

a pure fresh heart in the deeper blessedness of human communion and love, is not priced on any exchange that I know of.[1]

All the earth is gay;
Land and sea
Give themselves up to jollity,
And with the heart of May
Doth every Beast keep holiday;—
Thou Child of Joy,
Shout round me, let me hear thy shouts,
thou happy Shepherd-boy!

2. A man gives to another man his ideas, his inspirations, and his consolations, but if he is all that a man may be, then there is something more that he can give. If he has God, if he has taken Christ into his nature so that his life is a continual following of the Lord's, then see what a power of benefaction that man may have. It requires nothing great or exceptional in him. Certainly not great wealth. That has nothing whatever to do with it. Not great ability or knowledge, that has hardly more. Only the power to know God and to tell about Him.

You remember, I am sure, the story that our poet has written of the young knight who rides out after the holy Grail, and as he goes flings a gold-piece to the beggar who sits beside his gate, and the beggar will not lift it from the dust, because it is only 'worthless gold.' But years pass by and when the weary Sir Launfal comes home, old and haggard, there sits the leper still, and then as the knight breaks his single crust and fills his wooden bowl out of the frozen stream and gives the beggar food and drink, the blessing comes to him; the holy Grail, which is Christ's Passover cup is found, is the true act of charity, and the leper speaking with the voice of Christ—'the voice that is calmer than silence'—says, 'Who gives himself with his gift feeds three, himself, his hungering neighbour and me.' It is sad indeed to think of how much money has been lavished which was only 'worthless gold' because the self of the giver was not in it.[2]

I think it might be said my husband was a true 'son of consolation.' Many sent for him in their distress who were not even known to him. It was not that he said much: often he sat silent, and only listened to the tale of sorrow that was told. What he did say was always very brief, as were also his prayers; but there was an indescribable something in his words, and perhaps in the tone in which they were uttered, that reached the heart, drew it very close to the Heart of the Eternal Father, and left it there.[3]

[1] J. Baldwin Brown.
[2] Phillips Brooks, *New Starts in Life*, 134.
[3] *Life and Letters of John Paterson Struthers, M.A.*, 355 (ed. A. L. Struthers).

Third Sunday in Epiphany.

Thomas.

'Thomas therefore, who is called Didymus, said unto his fellow-disciples, Let us also go, that we may die with him.' —Jn 11[16].

Thomas was not a personal name. It has become, of course, a personal name amongst us, but it was not a personal name as applied to this disciple. It was a sort of nickname. For *Thomas* is just the Hebrew name for 'twin.' There is an old tradition which says that his personal name was Judas. But popularly he was always known as 'the Twin.' The word 'Didymus' is the Greek equivalent of Thomas, and also means 'twin.' It was, naturally enough, by the Greek form of the word that he was known amongst the Greek-speaking Christians of Asia Minor. And as this Fourth Gospel was written especially for them, one can understand the way in which John introduces him: 'Thomas, who is called Didymus.'

1. Now, what manner of man was Thomas, taking this sentence as our guide to his character? Well, first of all, he was a man of *great and unshrinking devotion.* The Christian Church has done less than justice to Thomas. It seems to have been Thomas's fate to be for ever identified with a nickname. He was called 'the Twin' in the first century. He has been called 'the Doubter' ever since. Of course, there is some justification for the nickname. He was the 'doubter' in his attitude toward the resurrection of Jesus. All the same, to call Thomas 'the doubter,' as if the sceptical mind was his chief characteristic, is not only not to do justice to him, it is to give us an absolutely distorted picture of him. For the chief thing in Thomas was not his doubt, but his *great and unshrinking loyalty to his Lord.*

They say that when the Scottish people signed the Solemn League and Covenant in the troublous Stuart days, some of them signed their names with their blood, and added the words 'Until Death.' Well, when Thomas gave himself to the service of Christ, he gave himself absolutely, altogether, and for ever. When Thomas put his hand to the plough he never dreamed of turning back. When he enlisted amongst Christ's followers, it was with the mental resolve that he was His 'until death.' And now death seemed to be the likely price of loyalty.

He loved Christ better than any one or anything

else in the world. He was prepared to hate his own life for that dear Lord's sake. And if in some respects Thomas is a warning to us, in *this* respect he is an example and a pattern. Thomas had the root of the matter in him, he had the one thing needful, for he had a supreme love for Christ. Do you remember that little poem of Watson Gilder, the American? It breathes that spirit of devotion which speaks through these words:

If Jesus Christ is a man,
And only a man, I say
That of all mankind I cleave to Him,
And to Him will I cleave alway.

If Jesus Christ is a God,
And the only God, I swear
I will follow Him through heaven and hell,
The earth, the sea, and the air!

'Let us also go,' said Thomas, 'that we may die with him.'

2. But the other side of Thomas's nature is also revealed in this little incident—namely, his continual melancholy. 'If to say *man* is to say melancholy,' says Dr. Alexander Whyte, 'then to say Thomas, who is also called Didymus, is to say *religious melancholy*.' That is profoundly true. There are some unhappy people who seem constitutionally unable to see the bright side of things. They cannot see the sun for spots. They cannot see the blue sky for clouds. They always see the difficulties, the drawbacks, the obstacles, the sorrows, the griefs, the losses. We all have to pass through the valley of Baca, some time or other. But these dear people seem never to get out of the valley of weeping. We all know such people. We knew them even in connexion with the war—people who fastened their attention on all the gloomy portents and were quite blind to every encouraging sign, people of an essentially melancholy cast of mind. Thomas belonged to that depressed and rather depressing company.

I mentioned in that little book of mine on the Apostle, that I think John Bunyan has drawn Thomas to the very life for us in his picture of Mr. Fearing. I have been reading once again the vivid pages in which Mr. Fearing is described, and I have arisen from the perusal with the feeling confirmed that, to get the right view of Thomas, no one could do better than read the passage in which Mr. Fearing is portrayed for us. This is what Greatheart says about him: 'He was a man of choice spirit, only he was always kept very low, and that made his life so burdensome to himself and so troublesome to others.' He went on to say, 'that Mr. Fearing was one who played upon the Base. He and his fellows sound the Sackbut, whose notes are more doleful than the notes of other musick are' ('Though indeed,' Greatheart says, 'some say the Base is the ground of musick).' 'Only this was the imperfection of Mr. Fearing, he could play upon no other musick but this, till towards his latter end.' There you have Thomas drawn as only the Tinker could have drawn him.

Mr. Fearing in Vanity Fair, says John Bunyan, was like a man possessed. He wanted to fight with all the men in the fair, so hot was he against their fooleries. In that place of danger he was the bravest of the brave. Which is exactly Thomas as we get him here—ready to face death on his Lord's behalf. But death it was he foresaw. Christ's words 'to the intent that ye may believe,' with their suggestion of great events, fell on deaf ears. Judæa conjured up before him only the picture of murderous Jews with stones in their hands. And so melancholy deepened into doubt. He was little inclined, Godet says, 'to subordinate the visible to the invisible.' That is to say, Thomas had not that triumphant and exultant faith which in the deep midwinter can speak of the spring, and in the darkest night can be sure of the dawn, and in the day of reaction and defeat can be absolutely sure of victory. Thomas was apt to allow the facts that were nearest, the dark, disturbing, distressing facts of the immediate present, to absorb his thought and fill his entire horizon. The visible blotted out the invisible. The hostile Jews blotted out the thought of God. 'Let us also go, that we may die with Him.' That was why Jesus said to him, in that wonderful interview after the Resurrection, 'Because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.'[1]

Fourth Sunday in Epiphany.

The Characteristics of Manhood.

'Quit you like men.'—1 Co 16[13].

What are the characteristics of manhood unveiled by the war, the manhood which the passage of centuries has created in this race of ours?

1. The fact about it that must first strike the least impressionable observer is its genius for comradeship. In our isolated individualist lives at home it is amazingly hard to believe that man is a gregarious animal: the reality of mass consciousness with its present fruits of mutual forbearance and mutual fellowship was evident as soon as the Channel was crossed. However uncongenial the new-comer, he found an immediate welcome and a large charity. However dissimilar the tastes and incongruous the character of his new friends, he found them living together in daily intimacy without quarrels and almost without friction. Men of all ranks were amazingly generous in allowing for the peculiarities and adapting themselves to the angles of their comrades. In every unit was developed a

[1] J. D. Jones, *The Lord of Life and Death*.

sense of membership, of corporate soul, so evident and so vivid that the weakest could stay himself without fear upon its support, and the strongest dared not set up his own will against it. 'Members one of another' is no longer a mere phrase. As of the earliest Church, it might be written that 'the multitude of them were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common.'

2. The second notable feature of the life was its gay and irrepressible hope. Most fresh arrivals thought to find at the Front a certain grimness, a never-absent consciousness of the close presence of death, an utter lack of normal as opposed to hysterical confidence. Despite journalistic emphasis upon the cheerfulness of our troops, they expected a death-bed atmosphere such as broods over many households at home. At best they felt that such cheerfulness would have about it the forced joviality of the condemned cell, that it would be hollow and unreal, a cheerfulness more pathetic than tears. To some extent, on the eve of an attack for instance, it was true that the gaiety was transparently artificial: men dared not in loyalty to the corporate soul let themselves go, they must combine to enact a farce where each separately would choose a tragedy. But apart from these spasmodic affectations, there was an underlying hopefulness of a wholly different kind—a hopefulness due to the fact that each one had at some time and once for all passed through the terror of his Gethsemane, had looked death fairly in the face and felt the cold blast turn his blood to ice, and, having counted the cost and learnt to know the worst, could henceforward go on his way with a clear eye and a stalwart spirit. Certainly it was almost universal, this hope of a good time coming. Over and over again, in nearly every one of the thousands of letters, says Mr. C. E. Raven, which it had been my privilege to censor, such hope was expressed. Generally its fulfilment was expected in that vague heaven of the fighting man, the days after the war. Very often it was focussed upon the happy land which to those under the hourly possibility of death seemed hardly more remote. Quite naturally men came to accept and express a confidence in the hereafter, a conviction that this life is not the end, that there remaineth somewhere, somewhen, a rest and a reunion.

3. Much less noticeable or obtrusive was a third quality which probably at first surprised the newcomer by its apparent absence, but which on closer acquaintance was readily discoverable and served to explain the other two. To any one fresh from the phrases of preachers or politicians the lack of all talk of sacrifice here at the Front came as a shock. The average soldier did not bother much about the rights and wrongs of the cause for which he might be called to die. He grumbled in lurid language of the hourly nuisances and discomforts to which he was exposed. He cursed the war and all its ways, declaring himself ready to-morrow for a peace at any price. He left all the talk about liberty and righteousness, humanity and civilization, to the speechifiers and journalists, only wishing that they would come out and go up the line a bit instead of talking. But at the back of it all, too vaguely grasped to be articulate, too sacred to be discussed, was the consciousness that he was in the right place, that he couldn't be elsewhere, that come what may he must do his bit, and that in doing it he was finding a curious, an unexpected and a wholly unacknowledged joy. He realized that a power larger than himself had summoned him to an act of self-denial, to a great adventure, and that in obeying the call he had not only laid down his life but had also in some strange sense found it. He had without knowing it and perhaps for the first time conformed to the law of sacrifice, to the ethics of Calvary, and in doing so vindicated once more the triumph of the Galilean.[1]

Fifth Sunday in Epiphany.

The Beasts.

'If I have fought with beasts.'—1 Co 15^{32}.

It is generally held that the beasts with which St. Paul fought at Ephesus were not the wild beasts in the arena, but the fierce Ephesians themselves. So our enemies are sometimes human beings who resist and persecute us, and the more fiercely the more they see the likeness to Christ in our words and in our life. But we may take the same liberty as the Apostle, and carry his metaphor from men to our own sins.

1. Between a man and his sins there is enmity. Each hates the other.

(1) In the first place sin hates man. The proof of that is the harm that sin does man, a harm that men are always coming to discover in deeper and

[1] C. E. Raven, in *Faith and Freedom*.

deeper symptoms of it, and of which even the men who cling most obstinately to its service are aware. As soon as we get in the least below the surface of our life, comes the conviction even to the wilful sinner that his sin is his enemy. Do you think he does not know it, the man who, every day while he sins, feels the jewels plucked one by one out of his crown, and the stain sinking deeper and deeper into the very substance of his soul? Do not you yourself know it when you do a wrong act, and almost hear the power of evil laugh as he drags you back one hard step further from your heaven?

(2) And if sin hates man, man hates sin. Is that true? The glory of the Bible is that it is full of the idea that the essential humanity, man as God made him, man 'pure in heart,' man as the child of God, does not love sin, but hates it. With all the intensity with which it asserts man's perverse clinging to sin, it implies, it declares everywhere, that that clinging to sin is diseased; that the true healthy manhood which God first made, and which Christ is trying to restore, shrinks from it and loathes it. Of that manhood we every now and then catch glimpses in the vilest men, something which by its look bears witness to us that it is the truest part of them, which has still left in it something of that antagonism to sin which is the life of the holy God they sprang from.

2. But if a man and his sins are always enemies, the force of the enmity is not felt until a man has turned to God. Dante tells us that it was when he essayed to climb the sunlit hill that his way was challenged. It is a very ancient problem. The psalmist marvelled that, whilst the wicked around him enjoyed a most profound and unruffled tranquillity, his life was so full of perplexity and trouble. John Bunyan was arrested by the same inscrutable mystery. Why should he, in his pilgrim progress, be so storm-beaten and persecuted, whilst the people who abandoned themselves to folly enjoyed unbroken ease? Many a young and eager convert, fancying that the Christian life meant nothing but rapture, has been startled by the discovery of the beasts of prey awaiting him.

3. What are the names of the beasts? The three fierce creatures that challenged Dante's ascent of the sunlit hill were a panther, a lion, and a wolf, and these three represent evils of various kinds and characters. If a man cannot be deterred by one form of temptation, another will speedily present itself. It is, as the old prophet said, 'as if a man did flee from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into the house, and leaned his hand on the wall, and a serpent bit him.' If one form of evil is unsuccessful, another instantly replaces it. If the panther is driven off, the lion appears; and if the lion is vanquished, the lean wolf takes its place. But there is more than this hidden in the poet's parable. Did Dante intend to set forth no subtle secret by placing the three beasts in that order? Most of his expositors agree that he meant the panther to represent *Lust*, the lion to represent *Pride*, and the wolf to represent *Avarice*. Lust is the besetting temptation of youth, and therefore the panther comes first. Pride is the sin to which we succumb most easily in the full vigour of life. We have won our spurs, made a way for ourselves in the world, and the glamour of our triumph is too much for us. And Avarice comes, not exactly in age, but just after the zenith has been passed. The beasts were not equidistant. The lion came some time after the panther had vanished; but the wolf crept at the lion's heels. What a world of meaning is crowded into that masterly piece of imagery!

4. The beasts approach each in its own way. The panther crouches, springs suddenly upon its unsuspecting prey, and relies on the advantage of surprise. Such are the sins of youth. 'Alas,' as George Macdonald so tersely says,

> Alas, how easily things go wrong!
> A sigh too deep, or a kiss too long.
> There follows a mist and a weeping rain,
> And life is never the same again.

The lion meets you in the open, and relies upon his strength. The wolf simply persists. He follows your trail day after day. You see his wicked eyes, like fireflies, stabbing the darkness of the night. He relies not upon surprise or strength, but on wearing you down at the last. Wherefore, let him that thinketh he standeth—having beaten off the *panther*—beware of the *lion* and the *wolf*. And, still more imperatively, let him that thinketh he standeth—having vanquished both the *panther* and the *lion*—take heed lest he fall at last to the grim and frightful persistence of the lean *she-wolf*.

It is just six hundred and fifty years to-day since Dante was born; but, as my pen has been whispering these things to me, the centuries have fallen away like a curtain that is drawn. I have saluted across the ages a man of like passions with myself, and his brave spirit has called upon mine to climb the sunlit hill in spite of everything.[1]

[1] F. W. Boreham, *Faces in the Fire*.

Creation, and the Origin of the Soul.

By the Reverend F. R. Tennant, D.D., Lecturer on Theology and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

In the cosmogonies of early religious thought, the idea of creation proper does not emerge. Accounts of the 'creation' of the world are rather descriptions of the 'making' of a cosmos out of pre-existing matter or chaos, the void and formless earth and primeval darkness; of man out of the dust of the earth, woman out of man, and the human soul out of God's breath. Nor did the greatest philosophers of ancient Greece attain to an idea of creation, at least not when they were expressly dealing with cosmology. Both Plato and Aristotle recognized a primitive ὕλη or *materia prima*, more or less intractable, which itself was never made, but which was fashioned or moulded into form by God. Thus Nature, at least in its formless state, was regarded as eternal or self-existent, and we are presented with a dualism—God and an independent sensible world.

It was partly to repudiate this dualism, and partly to avoid the unilluminating Gnostic theory of emanation, which is equally an example of inadequate physical analogy, that Christian theologians affirmed creation to have been 'out of nothing.' This phrase, however, though negatively of value as expressing a denial of the eternity of matter, is positively of little worth; and, indeed, it suits the pantheistic or absolutist types of philosophy better than Theism. For if 'out of nothing, nothing comes' be accepted as true, then the finite world must be regarded as the aforesaid philosophers do regard it, namely, as nothing but 'appearance.' Among modern philosophical interpretations of the world, pluralism dispenses with the notion of creation altogether; indeed, it has no place for it. It regards the world as a society of spirits of all ranks (when it is spiritualistic), all of which are self-subsistent, and no one of which is the ground of the existence of the rest. But for Theism, as distinguished from non-creational pluralism on the one hand, and from emanationist pantheism on the other, the notion of creation is indispensable. It is, however, like the idea of God, altogether transcendent, and cannot be derived from experience.

Nor do *analogies* from human experience carry us far towards a rational conception of creation. 'Making' is a metaphor that is quite irrelevant. And, indeed, any origination in time for the finite world is as difficult to conceive as an unoriginated existence: we are always liable to be asked what determined the Creator to call the world into being when He did, and how we are to conceive the life of God before the creation of a finite universe. Hence the tendency to interpret creation as something involved in God's very essence, rather than as the outcome of His will; so that, as Hegel said, God without the world is not God. Creation, if we adopt this line of thought, is a term which only gives expression to the fact that the world is *dependent upon* God, and without Him could not be. Causation is an inadequate or irrelevant category to apply to the world as a whole; it applies rather to change in the already existent, and to parts within the whole rather than to the world as a whole. The idea of 'ground'—of which that of cause is but a special case—is therefore preferable. But Spinoza, who identified God and the world, could speak of God as the immanent cause or ground of the world: this notion, therefore, is not sufficient to define the theistic position as to the relation of the world to God.

We are carried a little further by the analogy of what we call 'creations of genius'—works of the highest art which are sometimes spoken of as 'inspired,' and even as 'divine.' Here we have a case of a product in which the creator may be said to embody himself and to live, while at the same time he is distinct from and transcends his work. But this analogy fails us at the important point: there is a great gulf between our 'relative' creations of something new within the world, presupposing experience previously acquired, and the 'absolute' creativeness of God, in which world and experience are coeval, if not co-eternal. Creation in the latter sense is a conception which perhaps can only be approached at all if we regard it as what Professor Ward has called 'intellective intuition,' in which God 'posits' His objects, while in our experience they are only given and passively received. But into the mysteriousness of that process we cannot in-

quire further; we here reach the limit beyond which analogies from human experience cannot help us. We can only add that, in creating, God is not externally limited, though He necessarily limits Himself. Creation, again, is a hypothesis which can never be verified—science knows of no absolute beginnings; it is resorted to by Theism because it carries us further than otherwise we could advance towards an interpretation of the world as a whole; and, in so far as this advance is successful, the hypothesis is rationally justified. We have, indeed, finally to admit that the idea is transcendent, and attempts to minister to thought where conceivableness or imaginableness is out of the question. But, at the same time, it is precisely because the process of creation is inconceivable by us that, inasmuch as that process is beyond our experience, the concept of creation serves a purpose.

The foregoing exposition follows in the main the lines laid down by Professor Ward in his *Realm of Ends*; and it does so because that work seems to the present writer to contain the most helpful treatment of the problem with which he is acquainted. And the same guide will be followed when now we turn to the equally difficult and transcendent problem of the creation—or, not to foreclose the question, the origin—of the human soul. In his recently published *magnum opus*, *Psychological Principles*, Professor Ward deals with this issue from the psychologist's point of view; and what he says is of some interest for theology.

We have already seen that 'creation out of nothing' is not a wholly satisfactory conception, and have hinted that 'creation out of God,' or a Divine positing of His own experience, affords a better description of what we mean by 'creation' as applied to the physical world. And, as Lotze taught,[1] 'no necessity of reason constrains us to shun the thought of a beginning for the soul.' Pre-existence or an eternal past for human souls is a hypothesis for which our present life yields no evidence, and one which does not contribute to the better interpretation of either the ontological or the moral realm. Lotze held that the organic body does not educe the soul from itself; and certainly there is no more reason for embracing such a view to-day than there was when that philosopher was active. He, indeed, was definitely a creationist. His own theory of the world-process as the immanent movement of one world-ground, enabled him to speak of the Divine Being as letting Himself be stimulated by the event of the physical development of an organism to produce out of Himself a soul appropriate to that organism. 'The soul,' he says, 'originates neither in the body nor in nothing; it goes forth from the substance of the Infinite with no less fulness of reality than all actual Nature brought forth from the same source. And neither do soul and body come together by chance, nor is it the work of the body by its organization to make itself a soul corresponding to the possible form of its vital activity; nor does the Infinite arbitrarily distribute ready-fashioned minds to infant germs. But as with free consistency it makes every bodily organism the necessary result of the parent organisms, so also in the creation of souls it doubtless follows a self-imposed law, that weaves their succeeding generations into the gradations of an inherent affinity. The soul of the parents cannot be split up by division into the souls of the children, but we are left to the dim conjecture that the creative hand of the Infinite reproduces in the latter the mental image of the parents. . . .' Thus Lotze definitely repudiated the traducianist theory that the soul is derived from the souls of its parents, as taught by Tertullian (who derived the idea from Stoic philosophy) and by theologians from time to time in the history of the Church.

Professor Ward agrees on this main point with Lotze; and the interest of his contribution to the subject lies in his critical inquiry as to what can strictly be meant by the heredity of the soul, or the inheritance of mental characters. In legal affairs, whence the idea of heredity is borrowed by science, the heir and his inheritance are two distinct entities; the one is a person, the other a thing in no way constitutive of, or indispensable to, the existence of its inheritor. But in biology this is not so, though the fact is apt to be overlooked. There, what is inherited is never a thing or a property; it is a likeness to the parents *said* to be transmitted, and a likeness of which the heir cannot divest himself: heir and inheritance, in fact, are one. The analogy involved in 'heredity' is thus superficial, and psychology must inquire more closely. When we speak of the inheritance of minds, we may mean by 'mind' either the subject of an experience or the objective content of an individual's experience or mental *βίος*. Now, there is no evidence for continuity between the subject or experient and

[1] *Microcosmos*, Eng. tr., i. 399 ff.

any other subject, as there is for continuity between the parental and the filial cells in bodily reproduction. Such continuity between subjects Dr. Ward pronounces 'inconceivable,' and its inconceivability has led some to deny the reality of the subject. That, however, is a line which psychology cannot take. Physiological generation will not account, then, for the origin of subjects; and Dr. Ward repudiates traducianism as decidedly as did Lotze. On the other hand, we have said, 'mind' may mean the content of experience which is 'given' to the subject or experient; and in this case connexion with the germ-plasm which is continuous from parent to child is conceivable. But now we distinguish between heir and inheritance; the subject is only *called* an heir because his 'mind'—*i.e.* the objective side of his experience—manifests, as it develops, considerable resemblance to that of his parent. Then how arises the soul's *peculium* or property? Creationism asserts that it is created by God. This transcends the limits of scientific inquiry, but, says Dr. Ward, 'at least involves no contradiction, and recognises the two cardinal principles of psychology as we understand it, the individuality of the experient and the duality of experience.' We may not commit ourselves to the 'piecemeal occasionalism' in terms of which creationism is sometimes propounded (*e.g.* as by Lotze, in the passage cited above); but we must reject the traducianist view, because it does violate those cardinal psychological principles, and because, further, it cannot be stated without materialistic implications—the divisibility of a soul as if it were a thing in space like a germ-cell.

What on the side of mind is inherited, then, is the experient's 'objective continuum' when experience begins—that is, the individual's body *as it is for him*, with its instincts, etc.: the 'how he feels,' the germ of temperament and talent. Dr. Ward separates, it is interesting to observe, genius from talent so far as to assign the former to the subject, the heir as distinct from the inheritance, and the latter to his inherited *Anlage*. It follows that genius is not inherited, though innate.

There are difficulties for the creationist view as to the origin of the soul, apart from the mystery necessarily involved in the idea of creation itself. There is the fact that so many bodies born into the world are unfit habitations, from our point of view, for souls: those, *e.g.*, which condition the mind so as to produce abnormal and insane mentality. And if this is to be looked upon as but a particular case of the general problem of evil, it nevertheless differs from other instances of physical evil in the fact that, according to creationism, the creation of a soul for a given body is an event which is not wholly conditioned or determined by that uniformity of law which must obtain in the physical realm if the world is to be an ordered cosmos and a theatre of moral life. But certainly the difficulties attaching to the alternative theory of traducianism are greater, and, indeed, insuperable.

Contributions and Comments.

The Sumerian Epic of Paradise.[1]

Professor Langdon's new publication is a good deal more than a mere translation of his work on the *Sumerian Epic of Paradise*, published by the University Museum of Pennsylvania in 1915, in which he first brought to light, and translated from Sumerian, one of the most important Babylonian documents yet discovered relating to the origin of man. Readers of The Expository Times may remember certain articles which both Dr. Pinches and myself contributed to it on the book, and since then the newly discovered texts have excited a considerable amount of animated and sometimes acrimonious discussion in America. In the French translation of his work which has just appeared, Professor Langdon takes advantage of the various suggestions and emendations that have been proposed since his book appeared; his translations have been revised throughout, the interesting Sumerian Poem of the Glorification of Istar has been added, and the Introduction and Notes have been much enlarged. His American critics

[1] *Le Poème Sumérien du Paradis, du Déluge et de la Chute de l'homme.* By S. Langdon. (London: Luzac & Co., 1919.)

had denied that either Paradise, or the Deluge, or the Fall of Man is referred to in the Poem, and they also disputed his reading of the name Tagtug, and the position claimed for Tagtug as the first representative of man. To all this Professor Langdon offers a learned and temperate answer. The name of Tagtug has been found by Dr. Scheil in a lexical tablet; he was best known to the Sumerians as Uttu, and was reputed to have been the founder of some of the chief crafts of civilized society. Another reference to him has also been discovered in an early Sumerian cosmological legend preserved in the Philadelphia Museum.

So far as the story of Paradise and the Fall is concerned, Professor Langdon's case seems to me unanswerable. The question of the Deluge rests mainly on the interpretation of a single line, and is therefore less easy to establish. But it must be remembered that, apart perhaps from M. Thureau-Dangin, there is no living scholar who possesses such a profound knowledge of Sumerian as Professor Langdon, or who has done so much to throw light on its vocabulary and grammar. And his interesting and instructive account of the two schools of Babylonian religious thought, those of Eridu and Nippur, the existence of which, by the way, was first pointed out by myself in my Hibbert Lectures, ought to be read and pondered by every student of the Old Testament. In the legend discovered by Professor Langdon we have the Sumerian prototype of the 'Yahvistic' narrative in Gn 2–3. It is no mere accident that the name of Eve, the temptress of Adam, signifies a serpent, while the mother-goddess of Sumer, who created man, was represented under a serpentine form. It must be remembered that according to Talmudic tradition the first wife of Adam was the demon Lilith. In the Hebrew account the tree of life which man was forbidden to touch has been separated from the tree of knowledge, but it is noticeable that the same passage which mentions the tree of life also preserves a recollection of the Sumerian doctrine that the sin of man consisted in becoming as one of the gods, 'knowing good and evil.' 'Behold,' says Yahveh Elohim, 'the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil.'

Professor Langdon's earlier copy and translation of the text were made from photographs which, where cuneiform characters are concerned, are never satisfactory. Almost the only correction of importance, however, which an examination of the original tablets has brought with it is in the list of trees of the fruit of which the Sumerian Adam was allowed to eat. Among them was the cassia, which consequently was not the forbidden fruit. This was the fruit of 'the tree of destiny,' the nature of which was probably unknown to the authors of the legend.

To each of the eight trees whose fruit was recommended to man was assigned a guardian deity. It was through the influence of this deity that the fruit which he had in charge became a remedy for a specific disease. In this way the consequences of the Fall were mitigated by the gods: man, indeed, was doomed to die, but antidotes were provided for the ills to which he was heir. The legend lay at the foundation of that semi-magical, semi-practical system of medicine which prevailed in Babylonia down to the Greek age.

A. H. Sayce.

Edinburgh.

Capitalizing 'Lord' in the English New Testament.

In Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, vol. iii. p. 137, note to first column, we read: 'Neither AV nor RV of NT print Lord in quotations.' This probably does not mean that they print Lord outside of quotations. As the capitalization of Lord is intended to convey the intimation that 'Jehovah' stands in the original (F. H. A. Scrivener, *Authorized Edition of the English Bible*, 1884, pp. 116, note 5; 147, note 1), it ought not to appear at all in the New Testament, where 'Jehovah' never occurs, whether in quotations or not. It is probable that what is intended to be said is that Lord is not printed in the New Testament even in quotations from passages in the Old Testament in which 'Jehovah' occurs in the Hebrew text. It ought not to be, for the translators were rendering the Greek text of the New Testament, and not the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. But the statement is inexact for the Authorized Version. The first verse of the 110th Psalm is quoted in that version four times: Mt 22^{44}, Mk 12^{36}, Lk 20^{42}, and Ac 2^{34}, and in each instance Lord is printed—probably to distinguish between the two 'Lords.' It is reduced to lower case in R.V., with reference to which the assertion made is probably true.

Benjamin B. Warfield.

Princeton.

The Gadarene Demoniac.

THE use of the word λεγιὼν has always been a difficulty. The only other N.T. context, apart from the above incident, is the report of the scene in the garden of Gethsemane (Mt 26[53]).

Now, there is no example in Hellenistic Greek of this word being used with other than a definite *military* connotation (see Professor Souter in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*). Therefore it would appear that in the N.T. contexts the word should be interpreted *literally*.

In Mt 26[53] the reference to λεγιὼν must be taken literally in a military sense, λεγιὼν meaning an army, armed to protect, and certainly does *not* stand equivalent to πολλοί or πλείστοι.

Now, in the Marcan account of the story of the Gadarene, the Evangelist seems to have felt the difficulty—because he gives an interpretation of λεγιὼν—ὅτι πολλοί ἐσμεν; Luke gives a more definite interpretation—ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰς αὐτόν (Lk 8[30]). The very fact that the Evangelists give an interpretation shows that they recognized that there was a difficulty. May not the following be the interpretation?—

According to Josephus, we know that, from the time of Herod the Great onwards, Jews were drafted along with other subject races to serve in the Roman legions. We read that in attendance at the funeral obsequies of the above Herod were Thracians, Gauls, Germans, and the Jewish Guard (Josephus, *Wars*, i. 33. 9). Also, we know that from the time of Archelaus, Rome looked to Syria and Judæa to supply an ever-increasing number of legionaries for service within the Empire, and filled the gaps in the legions with the heftiest men from the provinces. Now, may it not be that the Gadarene demoniac was a man who (owing to his great physical strength, Mk 5[4]) was proscribed for such military service? But the terror of the Roman military tyranny, and the thought of expatriation, had unhinged his mind, leaving him obsessed night and day with the thought—λεγιών. Thus, when Jesus asks him his name, the word that springs to his lips is that which is ever upon them, the idea that is ever present and is the cause of his trouble — λεγιὼν — the Roman Legion. Thus we can understand why the demoniac besought our Lord, saying: ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ ἔξω τῆς χώρας (Mk 5[10]).

Our Lord in healing the Gadarene was restoring to his right mind one who had been mentally deranged by the anticipation of the rigours of Roman military service.

This explanation at any rate keeps us to the literal interpretation of λεγιὼν and makes possible an interesting exegesis of the healing of the Gadarene.

MARY M. BAIRD.

53 *College Bounds, Aberdeen.*

St. Paul's Speech at Lystra.

THERE is an interesting parallelism between St. Paul's speech at Lystra (Ac 14[15-17]) and his speech at Athens (Ac 17[22-31], particularly vv.[24. 25]), and the *Suppliants* of Euripides, ll. 201–218. Such lines as:

> αἰνῶ δ' ὃς ἡμῖν βίοτον ἐκ πεφυρμένου
> καὶ θηριώδους θεῶν διεσταθμήσατο,
> πρῶτον μὲν ἐνθεὶς σύνεσιν, εἶτα δ' ἄγγελον
> γλῶσσαν λόγων δοὺς, ὥστε γιγνώσκειν ὅπα,
> τροφὴν δε καρποῦ, τῇ τροφῇ τ' ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ
> σταγόνας ὑδρηλάς, ὡς τά τ' ἐκ γαίας τρέφῃ
> ἄρδῃ τε νηδύν—

seem familiar to readers of the two speeches referred to. Compare also Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* i. 2, 4: Sunt autem alii philosophi qui deorum mente atque ratione omnem mundum administrari ei regi censeant; neque veroid solum, sed etiam ab iisdem vitae hominum consuli et provideri; nam et fruges, et reliqua quae terra pariat, et tempestates ac temporum varietates caelique mutationes, quibus omnia quae terra gignat, maturata pubescant, a diis immortalibus tribui generi humano putant.

A. M. WILLIAMS.

Provincial Training College, Glasgow.

Entre Nous.

SOME TOPICS.

God's Sociableness.

Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith has issued a volume of Selected Passages from *Donne's Sermons* with an introductory essay (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 6s. net). How many living literary men would have undertaken to read through the three immense folios for this or any other purpose? Mr. Pearsall Smith has read through them 'more than once.' He calls himself a secular-minded person. And he tells us that 'the purpose underlying his selection is not theological, didactic, nor even historical. It is concerned with Donne as a man, as an artist and writer, with his personal accent and speaking voice; first of all with the man himself, and only in the second place with the doctrines he expounded and the age he lived in.' He has chosen passages which illustrate what Professor Grierson has called 'the unique quality, the weight, fervour and wealth, of Donne's eloquence.' He challenges any one who may think that praise exaggerated to 'read—and above all, read aloud—some of the following pages, the description for instance of God's bounty, which Professor Saintsbury has called unsurpassed, perhaps never equalled for the beauty of its rhythm and the Shakespearean magnificence of its diction; or the great peroration on "falling out of the hands of God," in which Donne sums up in a sombre and terrible sentence—one of the longest and most splendid sentences in the English language—the horror of the deprivation of God's love, and of eternal banishment from His presence.'

And now, for an example: *God's Sociableness.*—'Our first step then in this first part, is, the *sociablenesse*, the *communicablenesse* of God; He loves holy meetings, he loves the *communion of Saints*, the *household of the faithfull*: *Deliciæ ejus*, says *Solomon*, *his delight is to be with the Sons of men*, and that the Sons of men should be with him: Religion is not a *melancholy*; the spirit of God is not a *dampe*; the Church is not a *grave*: it is a *fold*, it is an *Arke*, it is a *net*, it is a *city*, it is a *kingdome*, not onely a house, but a house that hath *many mansions* in it: still it is a *plurall* thing, consisting of *many*: and very good *grammarians* amongst the Hebrews have thought, and said, that that *name*, by which God notifies himself to the world, in the very beginning of *Genesis*, which is *Elohim*, as it is a *plurall word* there, so it hath no *singular*: they say we cannot name God, but *plurally*: so sociable, so communicable, so extensive, so derivative of himself, is God, and so manifold are the beames, and the emanations that flow out from him.'

The Suffering Servant.

Professor A. R. Gordon, D.Litt., D.D., has already taught us some things about Isaiah in his volume on the Prophets of the Old Testament. Now he gives a whole book to the great prophet, translating anew and expounding as he goes. The title is *The Faith of Isaiah, Statesman and Evangelist* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net). Both parts of the book are covered, but a clear distinction is made between them. On approaching 'the great prophecy of comfort' (Is 40–55), Dr. Gordon says: 'We breathe no longer the spacious atmosphere of Isaiah's day. The kingdom has fallen, and the people lie prostrate and suffering, almost beyond endurance, though the days of their bondage are nearly ended. The local scenery, too, is far removed from the pleasant hills and valleys of Palestine. When these are introduced, it is with the wistful glance of the exile, fondly recalling his native land. The ground trod by the prophet's feet is the monotonous sand of Babylonia, blistered by the fierce blaze of the unclouded sun, and watered by sluggish streams and channels. The allusions that are thickly scattered through these chapters are likewise Babylonian: the temples and manufactories of idols, the processions of images, the gods and altars, diviners and astrologers, the crowd of merchants thronging the bazaars, the shipping, the treasures of gold and silver and precious stones, the trees and plants, even the animals. The great names that crossed the stage in Isaiah's lifetime have as completely vanished. The central figure is neither Hezekiah nor Sennacherib, but Cyrus, the coming deliverer, already represented in the flowing tide of his conquests. The literary flavour of the prophecy is as distinctive.'

How does Professor Gordon understand the Suffering Servant? The Suffering Servant, he says, 'is neither an individual nor the incarnation of an ideal—whether the personified Genius of Israel or the spiritual "Israel within Israel"—but the actual Israel "regarded in the light of its purpose in the mind of God."' In this interpretation he sees a lesson for our time. 'We are all so closely bound together by the ties of common humanity that the innocent suffer for the sins of the guilty, and on the other hand the guilty are saved by the sufferings of the innocent. The unspeakable agony of Belgium, Poland, Serbia, Russia, and Armenia, the endurance unto death of our bravest and best, and the patient anguish of loving hearts in all the war-spent nations of the earth, are thus no vain sacrifice, but the pledge of our redemption from every form of tyranny, oppression and barbarism, for through them the Lord and Father of mankind is bringing to birth in our midst the "new heavens and earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2 Pet 3^{13}).'

American Ideals.

Messrs. Constable are the publishers of a volume of *American Ideals* (6s. 6d.). The editors are Professor Norman Foerster and Assistant Professor W. W. Pierson, Jr., of the University of North Carolina. The volume contains the historical great speeches (or extracts therefrom) which express the ideals of the political life of America. There are Patrick Henry's call to war, Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, two speeches by Daniel Webster, Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address and his wonderful Gettysburg Address. There is a fine address by Roosevelt on A Charter of Democracy, and there are four addresses by Woodrow Wilson. The last chapter is a selection of estimates by foreign writers of the mind of the United States. The last is Mr. Balfour's speech before the New York Chamber of Commerce on May 12, 1917.

Can American ideals be expressed in a sentence? Yes, in three words: Liberty, Justice, Hope. Patrick Henry said Liberty: 'I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death!' Thomas Jefferson said Justice: 'Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.' Lincoln first gave Hope: 'With high hope for the future.' Woodrow Wilson brought all three together [to an audience of newly naturalized foreigners]: 'If you come into this great nation as you have come, voluntarily, seeking something that we have to give, all that we have to give is this. We cannot exempt you from work; we cannot exempt you from the strife and the heart-breaking burden of the struggle of the day—that is common to mankind everywhere. We cannot exempt you from the loads you must carry; we can only make them light by the spirit in which they are carried. That is the spirit of hope, it is the spirit of liberty, it is the spirit of justice.' Is there anything else? Is anything lacking yet?

The Worst Line.

The volume called *More Literary Recreations*, by Sir Edward Cook (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net), is just as good to read as the first volume was, a rare enough thing with second volumes gathered out of the magazines. And the first volume was very good indeed. There was the feeling for style, the choice of topic, the lightness of touch, the sense of fellowship. All this is evident and excellent in the new book also. The very preface is a charm. Sir Edward Cook returns to the question of the best and the worst—a study in superlatives. Some one has sent him this from Macaulay's Lays as the worst line of poetry in existence:

> And now, mine own dear little girl, there is no way but this.

And he thinks it would not be easily beaten as an example of comic bathos. But he beats it. 'It is attributed to "a friend who is passionately devoted to the study of the laws of sanitation and mortality. He carries his enthusiasm on the subject so far as to tinge it with his view of every conceivable matter—religious, political, and literary. He once wrote an anonymous letter to the Laureate, commenting on the lines in the *Vision of Sin*:

> Every moment dies a man,
> Every moment one is born.

He observed, with great truth, that if this statement were correct the population of the world would remain stationary, and urged the poet to alter the lines thus:

> Every moment dies a man,
> And one and one-sixteenth is born.

He owned that the exact figure was one, decimal point, ought, four, seven; but (as he said) some allowance must be made for metre."'

The longest and most instructive essay in this volume is that on the Greek Anthology. Many epigrams and mottoes are quoted in clever translations. Of one famous epigram ascribed, he thinks correctly, to Plato, he gives no fewer than eight English versions. He prefers this version by Dr. A. J. Butler:

Thine eyes are fixed upon the starry skies,
Thou star of mine.
Would I were heaven with multitudinous eyes
To gaze on thine.

Theudas.

The series of 'Translations of Early Documents' edited by Dr. Oesterley and Dr. Box is a scholarly series. But few of its volumes will be welcomed by the ordinary Churchgoer so gladly as the *Selections from Josephus* which Mr. H. St. J. Thackeray has made (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net). It is a wonder that Mr. Thackeray, who is one of the most accomplished and industrious of living scholars, has missed the article on 'Josephus' in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. It is written by Niese, the editor of the best edition of Josephus' works. Mr. Thackeray's Introduction is itself as good as an encyclopædia article. Every word of it is well weighed. And Josephus needs judgment in his editors.

In the Appendix of Additional Notes he discusses the alleged reference to Jesus Christ. His decision (against Burkitt and Harnack) is that 'the tone of the passage suggests a Christian hand.' He does not think that Jesus seemed important enough to be even mentioned by the great Jewish historian of His time.

For the other debated question whether St. Luke had read Josephus and was misled by him regarding Theudas, Mr. Thackeray's conclusion is: 'That the passage in *Acts* is to be explained by a casual perusal of Josephus by St. Luke is highly improbable for the following reasons:—

'(1) St. Luke gives the number of the followers of Theudas as "about four hundred"; Josephus writes "most of the common people." Clearly St. Luke had access to some source other than Josephus.

'(2) The carelessness attributed to St. Luke in the supposed use of Josephus is not what we should expect from the professions of the writer of the prologue to the third Gospel and from the handling of his sources in the earlier work.

'(3) If there has been error, it is older than St. Luke and goes back to his authority. Torrey in the above-mentioned work seems to have proved conclusively that Acts i.–xv. is based on an Aramaic source, to which St. Luke was "singularly faithful."'

NEW POETRY.

Rose Macaulay.

In *Three Days*, by Rose Macaulay (Constable; 2s. 6d. net), the war is again present, almost with the poignant insistence of its bitterest days, so keen is the poet's sensibility, so sure the stroke of her pen. Yet it is not easy to quote. Take this —the war is at least evidently over:

LONDON AT NIGHT.

How brief time ago we nightly trafficked heaven
Scanning the planets seven, and flinging up the skies
Bright ghostly arms of spies, white as snow!

Lest any fearful things should ride beneath the moon,
We closely did commune with the pilgrims of the sky,
Till earth's self seemed to fly, on black wings.

But since the set of Mars we have veiled the face of night;
We walk bemused by light, and have lost heaven's stair,
And the great booth's gaudy flare blinds the stars.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A BOOK has been issued from the Swarthmore Press with the title of *A Conflict of Opinion* (6s. net). It contains, as the title-page tells us, 'A Discussion on the Failure of the Church.' There have been many discussions on 'the Failure of the Church.' Even the Bishops have been choosing 'the Failure of the Church' as the subject of their Visitation Charges. But this is different from all the rest. The author is Mr. Arthur PONSONBY, formerly Member of Parliament for the Stirling Burghs.

It is a discussion between a Parson and a Doctor. The Parson is a well-informed, conscientious, progressive Churchman. The Doctor is greatly respected: 'I know all about your work; how you have devoted your life to it, not with a view to riches and fame which lay easily within your grasp, but simply out of the most exalted desire for service—a service I know you have often rendered while refusing any remuneration whatever for it.' And he is religious. But he does not go to church.

Why does he not go to church? The Parson calls upon him. 'I have called to see you because, although we have exchanged formal visits, I have now been three months in the parish, and I notice you do not attend the services in our church.' It is not a hopeful beginning. But the discussion is renewed next day. It goes on for a week. At the end a concession is made by the Doctor. 'Good-bye. . . . Look here. I shall slip in by the South porch into that back pew just for the sermon.'

There are many objections to attendance at 'the services in our church.' But most of them are frivolous and easily overcome. Three remain. They are all theological. The Doctor does not believe in miracle, atonement, or original sin.

Mr. PONSONBY's Doctor is the average educated layman. That is the educated layman's attitude, at least if he has had a scientific education. He accepts Matthew Arnold's dictum: 'Miracles do not occur.' They never did occur. The order of nature has always been what it is now. Miracles cannot occur. But why should he reject the Atonement? There are laymen, like the late Professor Silvanus Thompson, who detest the very thought of an atonement. It is their sense of justice, they say, that makes them detest it. No man has any business to ask another man to take his punishment. If he is a man he will take it himself. Mr. PONSONBY's Doctor rejects miracle and atonement for the same reasons as other laymen reject them. He dislikes the doctrine of original sin for a reason of his own.

'THE DOCTOR: The doctrine that we are born

in sin is the keynote of dogmatic Christianity because it gives us the reason of the purpose and design of God, and for His intervention through Jesus Christ for our salvation. My entire repudiation of that idea necessarily prevents me from having any belief in the circumstances which arose, according to the teaching of the Church, out of it. Now I am inclined to think—nó, I will be more positive here—I firmly believe that in man, as he is constituted, there exists a spiritual element. That is to say, after taking into account all the component parts of our nature which can be scientifically capable of reduction to physical elements, everything would not be accounted for; there would still remain some unknown quantity. As to whether this is consciousness vitality or individuality cannot be determined, as to whether it can be detached from the physical and have existence apart from it we cannot say.'

'THE PARSON: The soul in fact.'

'THE DOCTOR: Perhaps it may be simpler to call it that. But our definitions would not coincide. I believe this essence to be nothing short of the spirit of perfection, which is in us when we are born, making us the very opposite of children of wrath, and which, when we die, is untainted, unpolluted, as absolutely perfect as ever.'

'THE PARSON: You mean to say the soul is not contaminated by sin. Do you mean to imply that the soul is not injured by a gross and sinful life?'

'THE DOCTOR: That is precisely my point, and that is where we shall find another important difference between us. Let me take an extreme instance, in order to illustrate what I mean. I saw in the newspaper the other day the case of a woman of twenty-seven, who had been sentenced forty-two times for theft, assault, drunkenness, and attempted suicide. I will not enlarge upon the social and economic conditions or on our prison and reformatory systems which make that sort of thing possible. I only want to point out that when that unfortunate woman dies the soul that may still be in her will be as perfect as when she was born.'

It is the successful preacher who is invited to deliver lectures on preaching. The unsuccessful should once in a way have an invitation. He knows things which are hidden from the wise and prudent. He *is* something which it never entered the heart of the successful preacher to conceive.

But meantime we must be content with the successful preacher. The Rev. J. R. GILLIES, D.D., is one of the most successful. He was invited by the Authorities of the Assembly's College, Belfast, to lecture on the Christian Ministry. He has now published the lectures as they were delivered. The title is *The Ministry of Reconciliation* (A. & C. Black; 5s. net).

The whole course of lectures was divided into three parts. These parts the lecturer himself calls 'Mainly Historical,' 'Wholly Practical,' and 'Mainly Doctrinal.' What is left? Nothing is left except detail. The whole field of a minister's life and work is carefully mapped out and explored. It is the hand of a master in Israel. Experience, the experience of a long, varied, and always successful pastorate, spreads itself out before us. We see how God's work in a parish has been done, is being done, and may again be done, and we are moved to thankful following. And then, quite unexpectedly, we find that this successful preacher has a keen appreciation of failure.

It is the failure of our Lord. We dislike the word failure as applied to Christ. We resent its assumption. We deny its application. Yet there is a sense in which it may be used legitimately. It is when the success is in the failure, as it so often is, and as it was supremely—even of the eternal purpose of God—in Christ Jesus.

It is the failure of the Cross. It is the failure of the desire to come down from the Cross. It is

the failure of the agonizing effort to escape the Cross altogether. But most of all, and most momentous of all, it is the failure to retain the Father's fellowship while He hung upon the cross.

He did not retain it. Or was it only that He thought He did not retain it? Says Dr. GILLIES: 'I remember how I sat late one night in earnest converse with a friend. We were both preachers; our theme the Gospel, with atonement as its heart, and these great words as the crux of all. My friend, so far as I understood him, held by what is called the Moral Theory of the atonement. Without doubt, Jesus was for him Saviour and Son of God. With a fine passion, the more admirable because of the restraint with which it was expressed, he spoke of the inspiration, the new ideal, the sense of power which had come to him through Jesus Christ. I knew well how true it was—made good by years of hard and fruitful work in a poor parish in London. But he confessed that he had no explanation of these words save this: that, as earth-born mists obscure the light even of the sun, as the best and brightest of us is liable to fits of depression, so Jesus at that hour,—I hesitate to say it, but I think this was what he meant,—Jesus fancied Himself forsaken.'

'I could not then,' says Dr. GILLIES, 'accept that view; I cannot now. I make no claim to omniscience for Jesus. I have no sympathy with those who catch at His *obiter dicta* and exploit them as if they were meant to foreclose the way of scientific or critical research. But that at the centre of His moral being, at the very point from which depends the salvation of the world, He was the victim of a pathetic delusion, I did not and cannot believe. I feel certain that His experience as here recorded was not only subjectively genuine, but based on objective fact.'

Now, a man may 'feel certain' about a matter without being able to give reasons for his feeling. But Dr. GILLIES gives reasons. He finds them in his study of the development of Jesus as the God-man. That development was in two directions. It was expansive and it was intensive.

First it was expansive. 'As a child, He wakened up to consciousness in an earthly home. The sanctities of domestic life opened out into the wider life of the nation. That again, like a garment that is outgrown, rends and leaves Him face to face with the broadly human. "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness." There speaks One whose consciousness transcends the limits of space and time imposed on us, and identifies Him with the race.'

That is the expansive development. But at the same time Jesus developed intensively. 'Very early within the Temple, later in baptism and in many still hours of communion with the unseen, He fathoms the depths of His own mysterious personality. His life's breath, to quote the prophet's words, is in the fear of the Lord. "Every fibre of His being winds itself about God with an ineffable, sickening, fainting desire."'

'Along these two lines He moves *pari passu*; loving the world ever more as He loves the Father more, and in the holy love of the One seeing the infinite possibilities of the other; yet conscious of the growing distance between them. And now, as He hangs upon the cross, He sees, on the one side, a world hating goodness and, on the other, God hating sin, and knows Himself the mean term between these two, loving both. The mean term in this case is no arithmetical symbol but a human soul, strained to the breaking-point, yet patient, resolute, and in the end triumphant, in a love that cleaves with equal intensity and by the same necessity of nature to the world and God.'

Familiarity does not always breed contempt. Sometimes it breeds indifference. No one can repeat the Lord's Prayer and despise it. Many a one repeats it and remains indifferent to it.

And if there is one petition more disregarded than another it is the first: 'Hallowed be thy name.'

The word with which it opens is unfortunate. It is an accurate translation of the Greek, but it is not English. Constantly as we use it in repeating the Prayer, we have never been able to make a place for it in the English tongue. Every teacher has to explain it to the pupil, every commentator has to explain it to the teacher.

But more unfortunate is the word with which it ends: 'Hallowed be thy name.' What name? What answer does the teacher make? No answer. For the teacher has gone to the commentator, and the commentator has no answer to give.

If you turn to the latest and the best of the commentators you will find that they have no answer to give. What name? They do not seem ever to have heard the question. One says, 'Name represents God'; one, 'the name of God is "whatsoever there is whereby he makes himself known"' (quoting from the *Westminster Catechism*); and one does not mention the word at all.

But we ask, What name? For there is no doubt whatever that to the Jews, and that is to every person to whom the Prayer was given, God had a name. They might count it too sacred for accurate pronunciation. But they pronounced it somehow. And when they heard Jesus say, 'Hallowed be thy name,' they could only understand that the name of God was hallowed when God was hallowed by name.

Was the name *Jehovah*, then? One commentator says so. It is Dr. Joseph Addison Alexander of Princeton. He is somewhat old now, but he is worth beginning with. '*Name*,' says Dr. Alexander, 'is not to be diluted or explained away, as meaning everything by which God is made known to his creatures, but to be primarily taken in its proper sense of title, appellation, with particular allusion to the name *Jehovah*, by which he was distinguished from all false gods and described not only as a self-existent and eternal being (which that name denotes), but also as the God who was in covenant with Israel, the God of revelation and the God of grace, or in New Testament language, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

But we have not held to the name Jehovah. It is not that we have wavered about the spelling. The Jews were the cause of that. It is that we have passed away from the conception. And Christ Himself was the cause of that. Jehovah is the name of the national God of Israel; and Dr. Marcus Dods is right when he says: 'We cannot imagine Jesus as meaning merely that the national God of Israel may be duly honoured within the bounds of His own people.'

What name, then? Why not the name of 'Father'? 'Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name'—the two words seem to come very closely together. Luke brings them even closer: 'Father, Hallowed be thy name.' And yet few are the commentators who suggest that the name is Father. For Father never was a name for God.

But if the disciples were not to think of that name, the name Jehovah, with which they were familiar, if the name of God to be hallowed is to be a Christian name, is it possible that the name the Christian is to hallow is the name of Jesus Himself? We think at once of St. Paul's great passage in the Epistle to the Philippians: 'Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow.'

Now it is significant that in commenting on that passage scarcely a commentator is content to say that the name is the nature or the attributes of Jesus. They see there that a name is necessary. But they are not content with 'Jesus.' Nor are they content with 'Jesus Christ.' Remembering

that the word 'Lord' is used in the New Testament as the equivalent of the name 'Jehovah' in the Old, they understand the name in which every knee is to bow to be the name of *Lord*. And it is at least possible that that same name of Lord, applied to Jesus and standing as the equivalent of the Old Testament Jehovah, is the name, for the hallowing of which He taught His disciples to pray.

Is it not satisfactory? Then another suggestion has been made. But there is a tale to tell about that.

'There was rejoicing on the estate of one of the landowners of Polish Russia in the early thirties, for the son of the home had just returned from a far-away university. He was welcomed warmly, and father and son drove together the next morning to the village church to attend Mass and return thanks. During the service the reading of the Paternoster struck the youth as it had never done before. The rest of the hour was as good as lost to him—no, not lost, for in that moment he began to live.'

It was August Cieszkowski (pronounced Cheshkoffski). The son of a Polish Count, he had been sent as a student to Berlin, where he arrived just after the voice of the mighty Hegel had ceased to sound in the halls of learning. 'The Hegelian philosophy of history, with its famous syllogism of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, was virtual master of men's thinking. But the young Slav's nature revolted at many of its conclusions. As a devout Catholic he found it heathen, since it did not give the central place in history to Jesus Christ, and thus failed rightly to understand what the synthesis, the third age of the world, involved. As a Pole he refused to accept the "Delivered Germany" of the post-Napoleonic era, as the expression of this synthesis at all.'

In 1838 he took his doctor's degree in Heidelberg. He published some volumes. But fifty years later he told his son that all he had written was 'one and only one—Our Father.' His great work was on the Lord's Prayer. 'His plan compassed a work in nine volumes: of which one should deal with each of the petitions, one with the invocation, and one provide a general introduction on the subject of Providence in history.' When he died in 1894, at the age of eighty, only four of these volumes were completed.

In 1917 the present Count Cieszkowski heard that an Oxford scholar, caught by the war in Silesia, was studying his father's work. He made the journey across Poland to see him. He encouraged Mr. William John Rose, M.A., to prepare an English edition of 'Our Father.' It is published by the Student Christian Movement under the title of *The Desire of all Nations* (10s. 6d. net).

The volume, we gather, contains most of the Introduction on the subject of Providence in History, and a selection from the writings on the Prayer itself. The Introduction demands our attention first.

The history of the world is divided into three eras. The first era extended to the Incarnation; the second has extended to the present day; the third era begins now and will continue into the unforeseen future. The first era was the era of the first Adam, that is to say, it was a period of the human family in a state of nature. In the second era it was revealed to man that he is born of God and that he is his neighbour's brother. In the third era we shall realize that which has been only an ideal in the second, and shall pass to a higher conception of life.

This is not all new. Long ago F. W. Robertson familiarized us with the idea of three eras, though he made the second end with the Ascension. It is also a little indefinite. But let us proceed.

We need not delay over the first era. Its life was external. Men were members of a society or

a state, and under the direction of an external law. In the second, the Christian era, the law was internal, the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and the man was a man, with an individuality of his own and a relationship of personal moral obligation to God and his neighbour. It was all well in ideal—it was far from well in fact. So far was mankind from attaining to the ideal of love to God and love to man, and so much suffering came from the failure, that the idea was welcomed of another world than this, a world in which not only would wrong be righted, but every one would be able to fulfil his ideal of love.

Thus it came to pass that while the pre-Christian era was worldly, the Christian era was other-worldly. The third era will be worldly again. Its interests will be here and now. It will be able to realize its ideals so fully that there will be no felt need for another world of retribution and redress. More than that, God will be omnipresent, a fully recognized presence everywhere, and the recognition of His presence everywhere will make all men brothers. In His light they will see light.

Two things will be the sign that the third age of the world has begun. One is universal peace. The desire for universal peace has come. 'Everyone has "seen peace that it is good, and the land that it is pleasant," as Jacob said. Mankind as a whole not only desires peace, but also a lasting peace, established on an eternal, Divine basis, and not dependent on the gold-bars of the rulers' treasuries. Where voices have until now been raised proclaiming a mere possibility, to-day we have come to the belief in the Necessity of Peace!'

The other is universal action. 'Providence is showing man to-day that it rests with himself to do away with this gulf existing between what is and what ought to be; that resignation is not the last word of the spirit, but that in man Himself there lurks a further and higher power, meant to save him, and competent to bridge anew that lamentable abyss. This power, this faculty of faculties, is the Will—the summit of the spirit. The Will unites feeling with knowledge, and weds being to thought. From this union Action is born—the Lord of the Third World.'

These are the signs. What is the Power? Now we come to the Lord's Prayer and its first petition. When Count Cieszkowski repeated the Paternoster that day in the church at home he saw that it was not a prayer for the time then passing, but for the time to come. He saw that at best it was only an ideal for the Christian era; its fulfilment could not be until the third era of the world had begun. For a power is needed to fulfil it. That power is the Holy Spirit.

Now the Holy Spirit was not given until Christ was glorified. And when was Christ glorified? Not at the end of the forty days. Not at the Ascension, when He sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high. For still He maintained His presence in the world. It was a presence in spirit, no doubt, but He could appear to Saul of Tarsus. It was a presence everywhere throughout the world where two or three were gathered in His name. And all the while men prayed the prayer, 'Hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.' They prayed in faith but without fulfilment. Then when the fulness of time had once more come, the Holy Spirit came in power that the Prayer might be fulfilled.

And this is the name that is to be hallowed. For there is nothing higher than spirit. 'God is Spirit' is the highest revelation that has been made of Him. But Spirit has to be differentiated. There are different planes of spirits. What sort of spirit is God? The answer is that He is a spirit that has to be hallowed. He is a *Holy Spirit*. Whatever the disciples of Jesus understood, this is what He meant them to understand when He taught them to pray, 'Hallowed be thy name.' And this is what we are to understand. Hallowed be thy name, thy new name of Holy Spirit.

George Gillanders Findlay.

By the Reverend Wilfrid J. Moulton, M.A., B.D., Principal of Didsbury College, Manchester.

The news of Dr. Findlay's death brought a grievous sense of loss to a multitude of his old students and friends. At the editor's desire this sketch was planned whilst Dr. Findlay was still with us. One's thought was then that it was hard to write anything to which his sensitive modesty would not object when he read it. Now the difficulty is to find words to express one's debt of obligation to a colleague and a teacher so much honoured and so much loved.

George Gillanders Findlay was born in 1849, the son of the Rev. James Findlay. He was educated at Woodhouse Grove School, then a school for the sons of Wesleyan ministers only, at Wesley College, Sheffield, and at Richmond College. At the age of 19 he won the scholarship in Classics at the B.A. Examination at the University of London. Then he turned aside to Biblical work, seeking no further academic distinctions, until St. Andrews honoured him with the degree of D.D. in 1901.

From the time of his entering the Wesleyan ministry in 1870 his whole life was devoted to the teaching of the theological students of his Church. For the first four years of his ministry he served as an Assistant Tutor at Headingley and Richmond Colleges. In 1874 he was appointed Classical Tutor at Richmond. In 1881 he was appointed Professor in Biblical Languages and Exegesis at Headingley College, Leeds, and there he remained until his death on November 2, 1919.

Life at a Wesleyan Methodist College in those earlier days was specially strenuous. The Biblical Tutor was responsible for the teaching of both Old and New Testaments, whilst in addition, with a junior colleague to assist him, he gave such instruction in philosophy and classics as time and strength permitted. For many years Dr. Findlay taught regularly for eighteen hours a week, through three terms that lasted for eight months, whilst at the same time he gave much private help to men who were reading for special examinations. The Methodist tradition ranks previous service in the Church as the chief qualification for admission to its Colleges. Hence the tutor sees seated before him men whose University has been the factory and the workshop, and whose schooldays are far behind them, side by side with graduates from Oxford and Cambridge. To provide an adequate curriculum for so varied a group is a herculean task, yet Dr. Findlay fulfilled it alone till 1904, when the present writer relieved him of the Old Testament work. Out of this crowded life, with its scanty intervals of leisure, came the work by which his name is known to the world outside. The marvel is that he accomplished so much.

From his work in the class-room came first a series of works on the life and teaching of St. Paul. They include the volumes on *Galatians* and *Ephesians* in the 'Expositor's Bible'; on *Colossians* in the 'Pulpit Commentary'; the Epistles of Paul the Apostle in the 'Books for Bible Students'; the Thessalonian Epistles in the *C.B.* and *C.G.T.*; the article on 'Paul' in Hastings' *D.B.*; 1 Corinthians in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*; and Romans in Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*. In addition there is the priceless exposition of the Epistles of St. John published under the title *Fellowship in the Life Eternal*. On the Old Testament there are three volumes on *The Books of the Prophets* in the 'Books for Bible Students.' Then there is the Fernley Lecture of 1894 on *Christian Doctrine and Morals*; one or two volumes of sermons and addresses; and a multitude of magazine and smaller dictionary articles. This mass of work reveals a tireless devotion to sacred study which neither bodily weakness nor the pressure of the details of teaching could ever subdue.

The first impression that the student gained in Dr. Findlay's class-room was that of the need of accuracy and exactness. In the study of the Greek Testament in particular exposition was based upon the strictest and most minute grammatical analysis of the text. Winer and Meyer, Ellicott and Lightfoot, were the masters to whom he turned. His preface to his edition of Thessalonians in the *C.G.T.* is illuminating. After speaking of 'the precious Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul of Lightfoot,' and of the 'able and

judicious work of Bornemann in Meyer's *Kommentar*,' he continues: 'At the same time one reverts with increasing satisfaction to the old interpreters; frequent quotations are here made from the Latin translators—Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Bengel, beside the ancient Versions—who in many instances are able to render the Greek with a brevity and nicety attainable in no other tongue.' As he always followed 'the golden rule of quotation'—never to quote from a book till he had read it from cover to cover—this gives a revealing glimpse of the depth of his scholarship.

Yet at the same time he was far removed from slavery to the letter. He agreed with Simcox that 'the Greek of the New Testament was a real language that had a grammar, not a jargon in which any construction, any case or tense, any particle or preposition might be used instead of any other.' But he agreed with him further that 'textual criticism and grammar must be servants not masters to exegesis,' and so after the exact significance of words and tense and order had been sought out he went on to trace the real thought of his author, never satisfied till this shone out in its own light.

The same characteristics appeared in his private conversation. One would suggest to him some novel interpretation. He would listen with grave and courteous attention, ask one or two searching questions, and then change the subject. Days afterwards he would say, 'I have been thinking of the point you suggested.' Then he would give an answer revealing a consideration so deep and comprehensive that one was ashamed to have troubled him at all. In this, as in other respects, amongst the scholars of our day, he seems to have resembled most closely Dr. F. J. A. Hort.

An illustration of both these points may be found in his treatment of the South Galatian question. One well remembers the joy with which he greeted Sir. W. M. Ramsay's lectures on *The Church in the Roman Empire*, and commended them to all his students. He spoke of the way in which they threw open study windows and let in the fresh air of the busy Græco-Roman world. Yet whilst some wrote as though the position of the Galatian Churches had been determined once for all, his mind was unconvinced. For long it seemed to him that Greek usage made Ramsay's rendering of 'the Phrygo-Galatian region' untenable. A footnote to his article on 'Paul' in *D.B.* iii. p. 707, shows that he modified this view on later reflexion. But what weighed most powerfully with him was the conviction that the Galatian Epistle comes from the same period in the apostle's life and thought as the letters to Corinth and Rome. And in his latest published work, in his introduction to Romans in Dr. Peake's *Commentary*, he gives his final judgment. 'In the view of the present writer, Galatians and Romans, though differing in temper, were the offspring of one birth in Paul's mind and closely consecutive in time of origin. Romans is the calm after the storm; it gives a comprehensive, measured development to the principles argued in Galatians with polemic vehemence.' One cannot yet say that this question is decided. But to many of Dr. Findlay's students this last convinced and measured statement of their master's judgment weighs heavily against any other view.

As a further illustration of his power we may turn to his masterly exposition of Paul's argument as to the place of the Law in the divine discipline of mankind. 'This part of the Epistle' (Galatians), he writes, 'is in fact a piece of inspired *historical criticism*; it is a magnificent reconstruction of the course of sacred history. It is Paul's theory of doctrinal development, condensing into a few pregnant sentences the *rationale* of Judaism, explaining the method of God's dealings with mankind from Abraham down to Christ, and fitting the legal system into its place in this order with an exactness and consistency that supply an effectual verification of the hypothesis. . . . This passage finds its counterpart in Romans xi. Here the past, there the future fortunes of Israel are set forth. Together the two chapters form a Jewish theodicy, a vindication of God's treatment of the chosen people from first to last. Romans v. 12–21 and 1 Cor. xv. 20–57 supply a wider exposition, on the same principles, of the fortunes of mankind at large. The human mind has conceived nothing more splendid and yet sober, more humbling and exalting, than the view of man's history and destiny thus sketched out' (*Galatians*, pp. 197–198). The spaciousness and the grasp of such writing give its author an honoured place amongst the great expositors of all generations.

The volumes on *The Books of the Prophets* contain a continuous historical Introduction to the prophetic writings up to and including Jeremiah. They are written in the spirit of progressive con-

servatism, maintaining fully the right of modern knowledge to deal with the sacred text. 'It is now more generally understood that the old criticism (higher and lower) of rabbis and scribes, and of pre-scientific editors and commentators, from which many of the views inculcated in the childhood of the older of us were derived, is bound to be amended under the new light which God has given to our times. The light is bewildering, and the process of readjustment is disquieting for the present. But let us possess our souls in patience; "the firm foundation of God standeth."' Throughout these volumes the same thoroughness and mastery of authorities is manifested as in the New Testament work. Thus in the chapters on Jeremiah the works of Giesebrecht, Duhm, and Cornill, as well as the leading English commentators, are fully digested and reviewed. The chapter on the discipline of Jeremiah, sympathetic and penetrating, shows Dr. Findlay at his best. We may quote one pregnant passage: 'In Jeremiah the tragic mystery of God's dealings with the individual man stands over against the mystery of His dealings with nations in the larger play of human life. . . . Besieged by every sort of hostility, assailed by contradiction, ridicule, injury, with the whole force of religious authority and popular feeling enlisted against him—though his heart quaked all the while—Jeremiah stood faithfully alone for God and truth, as a lighthouse on its solitary rock breasting the storms of more than forty of the darkest years that God's kingdom on earth has known' (vol. iii. p. 184).

In the main, as these books show, Dr. Findlay adhered to the general critical reconstruction of Old Testament history, though, as often manifested in private conversation, he was not satisfied with the late dating of much of the Priestly Code, believing that more of it was pre-exilic than was commonly allowed.

In the closing years of his life Dr. Findlay accepted a commission from the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society to write its Centenary History. Foreign Missions had always been one of the ruling enthusiasms of his life. His family was notable for devotion to this cause. His younger brother, Rev. W. H. Findlay, whose death is just announced, after a distinguished career as a missionary in India, became one of the moving spirits in the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910, and afterwards did much to spread the spirit of the Conference through the Churches of Great Britain. One of Dr. Findlay's sons and two of his daughters have served in India, whilst he himself as a young man offered for foreign service only to be rejected on grounds of health. Whilst some of his friends regretted the loss to Biblical scholarship of the fruits of his ripened knowledge, it was felt that no more fitting choice could have been made. The task was an enormous one involving the reading of many thousands of letters and journals, and remained incomplete at his death. With the help of his gifted daughter, Miss M. G. Findlay, M.Sc., he published in 1913 one small volume—*Wesley's World Parish*. Condensed though this work is it abounds in happy portraiture. Thus: 'Thomas Coke possessed the imagination and audacity of the old sea-rovers. Where dreams of empire and the lust of gold, or the mystery of the fabled seas, lured those adventurers, this hero of the Gospel was drawn by the vision of the lost treasures of God's kingdom and the masses of mankind estranged from Him.' Another pregnant sentence reveals the method of the growth of the missionary enterprises of all the Churches who have been led through the daring experiments of pioneers to see the vastness of their world-task. 'Methodism's growth on Colonial soil resembled that of the British Empire, the extension of which came about in the first instance through sporadic private adventure, this being followed by local association inviting the control and fostering care of the Mother Country, through which the dependencies have been reared to adult nationhood.' The Church of Christ has had its Drakes and Frobishers and Clives who have forced new responsibilities upon it.

The Fernley Lecture on *Christian Doctrine and Morals viewed in their Connexion* was inspired by Dale's famous sermon on 'The Evangelical Revival,' which suggested that Methodism had failed to work out the ethical consequences of John Wesley's doctrine of entire sanctification. The Lecture expounds the central doctrines of Christianity and draws out their ethical implications. It reveals the deep interest of this quiet scholar in the wider social and moral questions of the day. Its programme for the twentieth century lies still far beyond us—'The abolition of war, the confederation of the Christian peoples, the organization of the forces of science for the uplifting of the

human race, and the establishment of a world-wide brotherhood of souls in the fellowship of God's Son Jesus Christ.' How deeply their master felt on these great themes will be known to those of his students who remember him in the autumn of 1914, with tears running down his cheeks, confessing his personal share of responsibility as a Christian teacher for the state of mind that had made the world-war possible.

For public life Dr. Findlay had little inclination. He is probably the only Wesleyan minister who has ever declined the highest honour in the power of his brethren to give him, the Presidency of the Wesleyan Conference. At times, when such questions as the preservation or renewal of the Methodist class-meeting fellowship were in debate, he gave much time and thought to work in Committee. On the rare occasions on which he spoke in Conference he was listened to with profound respect. But he loved to get back to his study, to influence by his pen those whom his voice was not strong enough to reach.

As a preacher he had none of the gifts of the orator. He had, it is true, the command of a pure and beautiful English style. It was an education and often a humiliation to take him some article and receive it back again with innumerable slight corrections, every one of which had to be acknowledged as an improvement. He had, as all his readers know, an almost infallible instinct for the right word. But a voice which at best was not strong, and a delivery that was halting and nervous, marked by long pauses, made him shrink from great assemblies. His happiest times were in little village churches, or at the College Communion Service with his students ranged before him. Many will remember the Quiet Days at Headingley when classes were put aside and the day given up to devotion. One thinks of Dr. Findlay then—the tall figure with the scholar's head, the voice breaking into tenderness or passion as he pleaded the cause of his Lord. One of these Communion addresses at least is preserved in the *Expositor*, seventh series, vol. v., under the title 'The Parable of the Pearl Merchant,' though the most intimate touches are omitted. Here the Pearl Merchant is the Lord Himself. 'Jesus grudged nothing, He hesitated at nothing; the whole wealth and capital of His being—His sinless manhood, the glory of His Godhead—He staked upon the enterprise; He invested and sunk *Himself* in the work of man's salvation; 'He loved us, and gave *Himself* for us,'—He 'went and sold all that He had' for His one pearl, 'and *bought it*.' That clinched the bargain, and fetched home the purchase: 'Thou hast redeemed us to God with Thy blood!'

This last quotation will do as well as many others to reveal the secret of Dr. Findlay's life. Through all his writings there runs, like a deep under current, the thought of the Cross of Christ. 'The glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, sitting on that thorn-crowned brow, clothing that bleeding Form rent with the anguish of Mercy's conflict with righteousness on our behalf—it is this which "shines in our hearts" as in Paul's, and cleanses the soul by its pity and its terror.' It is because of words like these that many of Dr. Findlay's students remember him even more as a great Christian than as a great scholar. By birth and by conviction he was a Methodist—'a Catholic Methodist' he would have liked to say—and the Evangelical faith was the very core of his being. We may close this imperfect appreciation of a noble and gracious Christian scholar with the closing words of his Will. 'I commit my soul to my Redeemer's care, and my earthly memory to the hearts of my children and my friends.'

Literature.

ASSISI.

THE sorest grudge we have against the Church of Rome is that she has made so many saints. There is that decent, kindly creature Francis—how we love him till we remember that he is a saint, how we stand away from him then. It is true that unbelievers utter the same complaint of our making the Lord Jesus Christ a God—it removes Him, they say, from our admiration and our imitation. But that is not true. 'If Jesus Christ is a man, and only a man . . . if Jesus Christ is a God'—it makes no difference in His case, we follow Him as a God as happily as we followed Him when a man. With the Roman Catholic saint it is altogether otherwise. He gains nothing by his sainthood, he loses his human beauty and truth and goodness.

But there are some compensations. If Francis had not been made S. Francis the great painters might not have journeyed to Assisi, and we should have lost some of our best beloved pictures, from Cimabue to Sir William Richmond. Not that it is the capital S. before Francis that has drawn Sir William Richmond so often to the spot. Far from it. The place appealed to him at once, and the man. And it is of the place itself that he has given us the fine pictures in that magnificent volume which Messrs. Macmillan have published—*Assisi: Impressions of Half a Century* (42s. net).

The illustrations are thirty-eight in number. They are nearly all in colour, and the colouring is surpassingly fine. Surely colour printing is the wonder of the sciences. It has leaped in one generation from the crude loud daubs we remember in youth to this, so rich, subdued, harmonious, pleasing.

Sir William Richmond would not have us overlook the letterpress. And that is not likely, even on the part of the enthusiast in art. For it is a well-written and informing narrative, the best 'guide' to Assisi one is likely to discover; and to the illustrations in the volume it is indispensable. One striking fact may be referred to, out of the many that are equally striking—the fact that even in Assisi people have forgotten the quarrel about the temporal power of the Pope. 'Sensible folk have settled down under the new circumstances of Italian unity; one hears no more grumble among the clerics that the Holy Father has been robbed of his estate. Indeed were it possible to poll opinion, even among strong churchmen it would probably result in a minority for the return of temporal power, which is recognized by the younger generation to be a thing of the past and never to be revived. This greater harmony and certainty produces a sober-minded touch between laymen and clerics, who do not glare at one another as they did before the union; now they meet upon common grounds of interest and meet without animosity.'

A WOMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE.

Miss Eden's Letters, edited by her great-niece Violet Dickinson (Macmillan; 18s. net), is a book to send one to sleep. So says the editor. 'A friend of mine read some of the proofs. I found on three occasions they induced sound sleep within a few minutes, which leads me to hope perhaps other readers may find them equally soothing.' It were an excellent service to some of us, quite worth the money. But it is not to be. The letters are too good for that. There is no pose of cleverness; there is no contempt for convention—unless in the letters of the Irishwoman, Miss Ftizgerald (before her marriage with a Scots laird); there is no feminism, and there is no agnosticism. But there is humour, honour, mental health, friendly loyalty, and love.

This is Miss Fitzgerald. She is visiting at the great house of the first Marquess of Lansdowne, and finds the Marquess a worshipped *bore*: 'I have been at some pains to get particulars of this form of idolatry to the god Bore, and have collected thus much: Bore is an evil spirit that, they reckon, commonly doth haunt empty places, but is more terrible when he doth infest crowded places. He doth possess people after the fashion of the Devils in Judæa, and hath, besides, a contagious property, it having been noted that one possessed will generally infect others.'

Miss Fitzgerald married Sir Guy Campbell, and went to live in Bute. 'I cannot bear Scotland, in spite of every natural beauty, the people are so

odious (don't tell Mrs. Colvile). Their hospitality takes one in, but that is kept up because it is their pride. Their piety seems to me mere love of argument and prejudice; it is the custom to make a saturnalia of New Year's Eve, and New Year's Day they drown themselves in whisky. Last New Year's Eve being Sunday, they would not break the Sabbath, but sat down after the preaching till 12 o'clock; the moment that witching hour arrived, they thought their duty fulfilled, seized the whisky, and burst out of their houses, and ran about drinking the entire night, and the whole of Monday and Monday night too. This is no exaggeration, you have no idea the state they are in—men lying about the streets, women as drunk as they—in short, I never was more disgusted. . . .' That is something for Mr. What's-his-name's second edition of *The Unspeakable Scot.*

Miss Eden was one of the many sisters of Lord Auckland, who was at one time First Lord of the Admiralty and later Governor-General of India. She did not marry. Lord Melbourne, the Prime Minister, would have her marry him, but his language was too lurid. She lived with her brother, went to India with him in 1835, and never got over his sudden death in 1849, though she out-lived him twenty years. For she could love, though she could not love a much swearing Prime Minister. And she had humour. Very amusing is her account of Lady Goderich, the wife of another Prime Minister, who sent out expresses all over the country for doctors because her husband had a bilious headache. The poor dear husband 'got quite well as the day went on and the dose went off, and then Sarah began to be frightened at what she had done; was content to be advised, and a third messenger was sent off to stop all the doctors he could find on the road. He turned back Warren in his chaise and four at Biggleswade; and West in his chaise and four a few miles beyond. Before the express came back, we were living in the pleasing expectation of going in to dinner,—Sister, Anne, Mary, and I—each arm in arm with a doctor —Clarke, Warren, West, and Swan—the Lincoln man. I wanted to make a pleasant evening of it, as there was not much sickness about, and after dancing a quadrille with them that we should take a little senna tea, and then have a good jolly game at Snap-dragon with some real Epsom Salts.'

And then the moral: 'Oh, by the bye, and another thing I have found out and meant to tell you is, that Virtue is *not* its own reward. It may be anybody's else, but it is not its own. I take the liberty of asserting that my conduct here has been perfectly exemplary. I never behaved well before in my life, and I can safely add I never passed so unpleasant a month.'

PSYCHOLOGY AT WORK.

You may first study Psychology as a science and then live psychologically, or you may first live psychologically, that is to say, adapt your life to your environment, and then study Psychology. But wherever you begin you must end with a harmony between your life and the life around you: otherwise you do not rightly live. The whole secret of the healthy life is Adaptation, and Dr. Edgar James Swift repeats the word till—no, you do not weary of it, for every repetition is a fresh case for investigation, but till you see that it is not enough to live, you must live adaptably.

Dr. Swift is Professor of Psychology and Education in Washington University. He has already written three books which have done well. His latest, *Psychology and the Day's Work* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), has the merit of being both popular and scientific. It may be read and understood by anybody, and yet it is constructed on scientific lines with scientific accuracy. Perhaps the most remarkable of its characteristics is its readableness. That is at once a gift and an accomplishment. No man could bring out this agreeable result without toil, but no man would toil to bring it out without the natural gift of appreciating it.

There is a curious chapter, specially written for the diner-out, on 'the Psychology of Digestion.' But the chapter on 'Our Varying Selves' is not less curious and more instructive. For its instruction costs us more. What are we to do with a man with two selves? What are we to do with ourselves if there is even the suspicion of a duality in our persons? It may be possible for our friends to see the one, our enemies the other, but what are we to do when we discover that there are two selves to see? Professor Swift does not tell us. He is not a moralist. He leaves us to find the means whereby we shall cast out the old man with his deeds and be wholly renewed. The great moment is the moment of discovery, and that is the moment which Dr. Swift gives us.

There have been some arresting cases of varying selves, in fiction and out of it. There is General McClellan, an interesting but rather disappointing study. There is Sir John Hawkins: 'His love for his fellow-sailors led him to devote his fortune to founding a hospital for indigent sailors. Yet this fortune was made in the slave traffic, in which on his own boats and with his knowledge the most atrocious cruelties were practised, the slaves being treated far worse than cattle.' But when Dr. Swift comes to the Anti-vivisectionists and allows himself a most unjust reflexion upon the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, we wonder if we have discovered one varying self more than the chapter was meant to contain.

JACOPONE DA TODI.

Miss Evelyn Underhill has done another and an immense service to the cause of mystical religion. She has published a selection from Jacopone da Todi's 'Laude,' with a verse translation by Jessie Beck and an Introduction by herself. *Jacopone da Todi, Poet and Mystic* (Dent; 16s. net)—that is the title.

Miss Underhill gives her judgment of Jacopone's 'Laude' at once. 'His *laude*,' she says, 'when we have learned to read them rightly, constitute a human document as complete as the *Confessions* of St. Augustine, or the autobiography of Suso; perhaps more trustworthy, since they record his immediate reactions to experience, and are not—save in a few instances—the fruit of reflection upon emotions that are past.'

But first a few facts. Jacopone was born at Todi of an old Umbrian family about '1228 or 1230, soon after St. Francis died and whilst St. Clare had still twenty years or more to live, and dying in 1306—when Dante was forty-one—the span of his life covered the most impressive period of the Middle Ages: the last years of the Emperor Frederick II., and the whole reign of St. Louis, the careers of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventura. He saw the short papacy of Celestine V., the hermit saint whom Dante placed in hell. Living in the world until he was about forty years of age, a brilliant lawyer, a man of strong passions, wide cultivation and fastidious tastes, he is then said to have experienced a sudden and dramatic conversion: and, after following for ten years, like the English mystic Richard Rolle, the roving career of a missionary hermit, he entered the Franciscan family as a lay-brother in 1278. He therefore brought to the service of religion an acute intellect, great knowledge of the world, and all the powers of a developed manhood.' For his satirical poems on Boniface VIII. he was condemned to imprisonment and spent five years (1298 to 1303) in the dungeons beneath the castle of Palestrina. He died on Christmas Eve, 1306, in the convent of Poor Clares at Collazzone; a small hill-town between Todi and Perugia.

There are probably not a few who know his name only in connexion with the authorship of the 'Stabat Mater.' The authorship lies between him and Pope Innocent III. Miss Underhill seems willing to let it go to the Pope. Jacopone's numerous 'Laude' or Songs are sufficient reputation. Miss Underhill, as we have seen, gives them a high place as mysticism; they deserve a high place also as poetry. Even those who 'may not sympathize with his religious attitude, cannot fail to admire the magnificent poems in which it is expressed: mystical love-songs matching in the sphere of spiritual passion the most beautiful lyrics of his Tuscan and Bolognese contemporaries.'

It is not easy to give examples in translation. In the early stanzas of 'La Bontade se lamenta' he gives a vivid picture of the emotional fervours of the soul touched by grace.

For when Desire that food doth taste,
—The sweets of grace, and given for nought!—
New life in all her being wakes,
In mind, and memory, and thought.
The will to wondrous change is wrought;
Her former sins she doth lament,
With yearning grief most vehement;
She finds no comfort and no cheer.

Now a new language doth she speak,
'Love, Love,' is all her tongue can say.
She weeps and laughs; rejoices, mourns,
In spite of fears, is fair and gay;
And though her wits seem all astray,
—So wild, so strange, her outward mien—
Her soul within her is serene;
And heeds not how her acts appear.

THE BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

It would be no disparagement of the author, Professor John Franklin Genung, if we were to say that *A Guidebook to the Biblical Literature* (Ginn; 10s. 6d. net) is a popular Driver. But it might suggest undue dependence, and there is no such thing. Professor Genung's position is even a little in advance of Driver's here and there, and everywhere he has his own judgment to give, though of course he has studied Driver diligently.

Take it then at that—a popular Driver. To how many students has Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* been the gift of a new Bible? To how many has it been the recovery of a lost faith? Let Professor Genung's book be to the lay reader what Driver's has been to the student.

Professor Genung covers the whole ground, for it is a book of nearly seven hundred pages; yet of the many topics he touches there are few that he fails to throw some fresh light upon, or at least to emphasize some forgotten aspect of. He brings out the sense of national solidarity in the Hebrew prophets: 'As the message of the prophets was rather to nations than to individuals, their conception of character is in the absolute and in the mass,—a whole nation's traits at once. The nation or race, with the large resultant of its inherited and cultivated traits, was its unit of character; its fortunes and destiny those of an organic community. The religious and moral principles inculcated are indeed the same for individual and nation; but it is with the kind of nation that the sum of individual traits produces, the whole nation as it were a solidarity and composite personality, that the prophets are concerned. The Hebrew race's survival and mission in the large movements of the times, accordingly, depend on their character and stamina as a people educated in Jehovah's ways and moulded morally to his will.'

He recognizes the positive character of the Mosaic Law: 'We look at its central ordinance, that digest of commandments that can be counted on the ten fingers (the "Ten words," Ex. xx., Deut. v.), and at first thought they look like mere prohibitions, what *not* to do. But do they not thereby do human nature the honour of taking for granted that men, the negative barriers removed, will go on to *do* the positive good of their own motion? That is how Moses seems to regard it when, after his Deuteronomic recounting of the ten words, he goes on to give its spiritual appeal in its attitude toward God. "Hear, O Israel," he says; "the Lord our God, the Lord is one. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deut. vi. 4). He resolves it into a commandment of love,—a positive relation only possible to the inner life.'

DAVID W. FORREST.

Dr. J. H. Leckie has written a short memoir to introduce to us the sermons and theological papers which he has selected from the manuscripts of *David W. Forrest, D.D.*, Professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics in the United Free Church College, Glasgow (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. net).

The photographic frontispiece is extraordinarily good. You look again and again at the short face with its broad forehead, straight nose, and searching eyes. You judge that you have a man of self-discipline, who will be just toward all men but will not suffer fools gladly. Dr. Leckie knew him well. The portrait does *not* belie him.

But there was another strain—the photograph should have been taken twice. In this you do not see the man who was so gladly received at the sick pillow; nor do you see the man of this 'characteristic incident': 'I recall one characteristic incident of a visit paid to a worthy woman—a widow in humble circumstances and advanced in years whom I used to visit as the Elder of her district. She was in feeble health, and was lying down when Dr. Forrest called. No time was lost in inviting him to take a cup of tea with her, to which he gladly assented. She then wished to rise to carry out her hospitable intention; but this he would not allow, protesting that he was quite able to make the preparations himself. And accordingly (under instruction) he proceeded to infuse the tea and collect the other materials necessary for the meal. And then, after serving her, he sat down by the bedside, and they took tea together with much laughter and enjoyment.'

There are fifteen sermons, including two or three Communion Addresses. They are quite worthy of the man, and they give us the whole of him. The Communion Addresses are as fine in spiritual sympathy as in scholarship, and their expression is faultless. There are surprises. Who would have

expected the condescension to anecdote? But in the sermon on 'Wonder' this tells well: 'An African chief was once invited to the Court of Queen Victoria: and he was asked afterwards, "What of all things he had seen had most impressed him?" He replied: "The splendour of it all, and many things else, impressed me: but the greatest surprise of all was to find myself there."' There is his love of poetry too, poetry that some would call sentimental, and his impressive rendering of it. But he was a man of surprises, invigorating, redeeming.

SOCIALISM.

Mr. J. A. Hobson introduces to us *The Meaning of Socialism*, by Mr. J. Bruce Glasier (Manchester: National Labour Press; 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d.). And in introducing it he says this: 'In choosing words one would say that the most profitable labour for Socialism is in the field of "humanism." If the term sounds a little "precious" or "pedantic" that can't be helped. It can and ought to be rescued from these contemptuous implications. For it is wanted to express the need and demand that Society shall be so transformed as to furnish for all its members a fully human life. From such a Socialism there easily and inevitably falls away the charge of materialism, based upon an overstressing of distinctively economic conditions, the charge of regimentalism and loss of liberty based on magnifying the State, and the charge of proletarian violence as the instrument of reform.'

He adds: 'It is the high and peculiar merit of this book of Bruce Glasier's, that it expresses more fully, more freely, and, I think, more successfully than any other of our time, this humanist interpretation and outlook.'

It is true. If this is Socialism there is no fear for real religion. Mr. Glasier will not accept any sacerdotalism in religion. He will have nothing to do with 'sacerdotal beliefs.' And he brings under the name of religion, 'all forms of educational and benevolent propaganda, all pleadings and preachings of ideas of right against wrong, of truth against error.' But 'Socialism, in truth, consists, when finally resolved, not in getting at all, but in giving; not in being served, but in serving; not in selfishness, but in unselfishness; not in the desire to gain a place of bliss in this world for one's self and one's family (that is the individualist and capitalist aim), but in the desire to create an earthly paradise for all. Its ultimate moral, as its original biological justification, lies in the principle, human and divine, that "as we give, so we live," and only in so far as we are willing to lose life do we gain life.'

MISSIONS AFTER THE WAR.

The Rev. A. J. Macdonald, M.A., made so favourable an impression on the student of political Christianity by his first book that the volume entitled *The War and Missions in the East* (Scott; 7s. 6d. net) which he has now published is sure at least of a careful reading. And that is what it needs and all it needs. The subject is vast and difficult. Mr. Macdonald has a good sound style; he says clearly what he clearly sees; and we have to give him time to impress us. We must read slowly, especially the great chapters on India, and read some of them again.

The result is likely enough to be a conviction that the time has come for a complete revolution in our missionary methods. For we have to recognize that the East *is* the East, as Kipling has been telling us, and must be left to follow Christ in its own way. The fact is—we quote Mr. Macdonald—'the fact is that the East possesses its own methods of thought, its own means of interpretation, its own way of self-expression. Our part is to give it universal concepts and leave it to work them into its own life in whatever manner seems best. Our business is to give to the Oriental Christ, to teach Christ as we were taught Christ from the lesson book of the Gospels, to teach Him as the universal Man, to speak of His Spirit as the universal God. For the rest the East can find its own dogma, its own creeds. There is nothing save our patronizing lack of confidence in the Oriental Churches to prevent our standing aside while an Indian, a Japanese, a Chinese scheme of belief or dogma is drawn up.'

There is the danger of all sorts of sects and heresies appearing. We must risk it. And we should remember that such modern movements as the Indian Samajes 'aim a more effective blow at their own religious systems than at Christianity. For the present the Samajes may be making converts, they may even prevent people from becoming Christians, but they are also weaning their people away from ancient tradition which

presents the most effective opposition to the Gospel. They are accustoming the East to the idea that a man can be saved without adherence to the old religious teaching.' Our Gospel teaches that Christ 'is the Spirit of life, and from this teaching the Western Church should take confidence that the life which is Christ cannot be stifled or lost by the Oriental mind when it seeks to interpret Him, nay that life will vivify and invigorate the intellect of the East as it has given life and movement to that of Europe.'

JERUSALEM.

How Jerusalem was Won is the title which Mr. W. T. Massey has given to his record of Allenby's campaign in Palestine (Constable; 21s. net). It is a good title. For the capture of Jerusalem was to us the centre of interest in the campaign and its own climax. We are very proud of the capture of Jerusalem by Allenby; we are very proud that when captured he entered it as a Christian.

One has sometimes wondered whether the captors themselves shared the excitement of those who were not there. Mr. Massey tells us: 'I have asked many men who were engaged in the fight for Jerusalem what their feelings were on getting their first glimpse of the central spot of Christendom. Some people imagine that the hard brutalities of war erase the softer elements of men's natures; that killing and the rough life of campaigning, where one is familiarised with the tragedies of life every hour of every day, where ease and comfort are forgotten things, remove from the mind those earlier lessons of peace on earth and goodwill toward men. That is a fallacy. Every man or officer I spoke to declared that he was seized with emotion when, looking from the shell-torn summit of Nebi Samwil, he saw the spires on the Mount of Olives; or when reconnoitring from Kustul he got a peep of the red roofs of the newer houses which surround the old City. Possibly only a small percentage of the Army believed they were taking part in a great mission, not a great proportion would claim to be really devout men, but they all behaved like Christian gentlemen. One Londoner told me he had thought the scenes of war had made him callous and that the ruthless destruction of those things fashioned by men's hands in prosecuting the arts of peace had prompted the feeling that there was little in civilisation after all, if civilisation could result in so bitter a thing as this awful fighting. Man seemed as barbaric as in the days before the Saviour came to redeem the world, and whether we won or lost the war all hopes of a happier state of things were futile. So this Cockney imagined that his condition showed no improvement on that of the savage warrior of two thousand years ago, except in that civilisation had developed finer weapons to kill with and be killed by. The finer instincts had been blunted by the naked and unashamed horrors of war. But the lessons taught him before war scourged the world came back to him on getting his first view of the Holy City. He felt that sense of emotion which makes one wish to be alone and think alone. He was on the ground where Sacred History was made, perhaps stood on the rock the Saviour's foot had trod. In the deep stirring of his emotions the rougher edges of his nature became rounded by feelings of sympathy and a belief that good would come out of the evil of this strife. That view of Jerusalem, and the knowledge of what the Holy Sites stand for, made him a better man and a better fighting man, and he had no doubt the first distant glimpse of the Holy City had similarly affected the bulk of the Army.'

We have spoken of our pride in the manner of Allenby's entrance into Jerusalem. Our pride is no less in the behaviour of our troops after entering. Says Mr. Massey: 'When Jerusalem was won and small parties of our soldiers were allowed to see the Holy City, their politeness to the inhabitants, patriarch or priest, trader or beggar, man or woman, rebuked the thought that the age of chivalry was past, while the reverent attitude involuntarily adopted by every man when seeing the Sacred Places suggested that no Crusader Army or band of pilgrims ever came to the Holy Land under a more pious influence. Many times have I watched the troops of General Allenby in the streets of Jerusalem. They bore themselves as soldiers and gentlemen, and if they had been selected to go there simply to impress the people they could not have more worthily upheld the good fame of their nation. These soldier missionaries of the Empire left behind them a record which will be remembered for generations.'

How many of us have ever realized the difficulties of this campaign? We cannot realize them. The one difficulty of water we cannot realize. Before the great movement began the troops were taught

to live on as little water as possible. A systematic water-abstinence training was gone through, which lasted three weeks.

SIR VICTOR HORSLEY.

The first half of Mr. Stephen Paget's Life of *Sir Victor Horsley* (Constable; 21s. net) is so medical, more than that, so surgical, that the general reader will get little out of it. He will be interested in the stamping-out of hydrophobia, and perhaps in the progress made towards the stamping-out of cretinism, and will be glad to see that he can understand some of the surgical experiments. But the real interest will begin with the second half of the book.

For then we come to Sir Victor Horsley himself. And great as the surgeon was—the greatest it would seem of his day—the man was greater. '"I was lucky enough," says a well-known surgeon, who was his assistant in private practice, "to be associated with him for many years; and my admiration for him steadily grew throughout the time, and under conditions in which bogus 'greatness' could not fail to betray itself. There was in him a hint of the archangel that I never discovered in any other man, and that made one feel that he could never be anything but young and strong." It is the exact phrase, "a hint of the archangel in him"; or the look of a head of Apollo on a Greek coin: but the upper part of his face was stronger than the lower part. His eyes were dark blue-grey, deep-set, and keen; he had perfect vision, but a touch of colour-blindness: and he and his brother Gerald had a little "flare" of white hair above the forehead. The tone of his voice and laughter was very musical; and he and Gerald had a way of pronouncing *th* as *v*. In the use of his hands, he was absolutely ambidextrous: he had been left-handed to begin with. He could even draw on wood equally well with either hand. His movements were quick and purposeful. Always, he held his head up and his shoulders back: no tricks, no pose: he was just himself, wherever he was. He neither showed off his gifts, nor could he hide them; and when he came into a dull roomful of guests, there was an odd effect as if the lamps went up of their own accord.' That is most impressive from a biographer who had no sympathy for the 'causes' to which Sir Victor Horsley gave up so much of his life and energy.

Then of course there comes the weakness. What was it? A determination to see his own side of the picture too exclusively, an impatience with the other man's side. It is true the other man was likely to be easy-going or even incompetent, but there is need of patience. 'Like Ajax raging to himself in his tent, and mistaking a flock of sheep for his enemies, he was unwise in his wrath, and would attack harmless people with strange misunderstanding of them. He bewildered and exasperated us: he shook us up: he shone us down. It all comes back to the phrase that there was nobody like him: as it was said of him, at some German festival dinner, "Und da steht Horsley wie ein Gott." One can hardly imagine him in old age, slow and infirm and past work: he did not have to face it.'

And yet how considerate he could be. It is Dr. H. Huxley who says: 'I met him constantly in work, and learned more from his methods than from any one I have ever known. The kindest of men—he was ever ready to operate on or see the needy folks, with or without a nominal fee.' And there is a letter from the father of a child on whom Horsley operated for microcephaly. 'In the autumn of the year 1897, I took my child, then about nine months old, to seek the doctor's advice, the baby's forehead being contracted, there being no fontanelle. Sir Victor strongly advised an operation: and as I was not well off it was a great relief to me that he never charged me a penny either for the two consultations or for the two operations (my wife's brother and my own brother being doctors), besides which he gratified my wife's longing to be with her child—her first—by procuring a private ward for her at University Hospital. Two pieces of bone were removed at an interval of a fortnight. The child rapidly recovered. . . . He has been a comfort to us all our life. . . . He has been a year in charge of a trench mortar battery, and has been especially commended for repelling a raid in the trenches. So that I have much to be thankful for, that under God I met with Sir Victor.'

His death in the Mesopotamian expedition is recent history. Many have said he was foolhardy. No. He was hardy, that is courageous, even to self-sacrifice on behalf of others, but he was no fool.

One of the most unexpected results of the comparative study of religion is to establish the fact that in the most primitive society to which we can penetrate the custom was to reckon lineage from the mother. It has been long discussed and disputed, but Dr. E. Sidney Hartland has assuredly settled the question now. You will find the evidence most lucidly set forth in a paper read before the American Anthropological Association and entitled *Matrilinial Kinship and the Question of its Priority.*

The first number of 'The Pilgrim's Books,' a new series attractively printed and conveniently bound for the pocket, is a translation by 'a Graduate of Cambridge' of Johann Zimmerman's famous book. *The Pleasures of Solitude* is the title (Philip Allan & Co.; 5s. net). Not a word is said about the author; we are simply offered the book. We might have been reminded—for who can remember the facts of even so great a man's life?—that Zimmerman was born at Brugg, near Berne, in 1728, became public physician to his native town, and then was appointed physician for Hanover to George III. He attended Frederick the Great in his last illness. He published many books (two of them about Frederick, and one about himself), but only the book on Solitude is known to the world. It is elaborate, but the meditative reader can take time and rather prefers elaboration. His eulogy on Hume, with whom he felt a strong affinity, is well known and it is well worth knowing. This is the beginning of it:

'This profound philosopher and historian possessed a mild temper, a lively sociable disposition, a high sense of friendship, and an incorruptible integrity. His manners, indeed, appeared at first sight cold, for he had sacrificed little to the Graces; but his mind was invariably cheerful and his affections warm, and neither his ardent desire of fame nor the calumnies of his enemies was capable of disturbing his serenity. His life was passed in the constant exercise of benevolence; and even those who had been seduced by the artifices of others wantonly to attack his character with obloquy experienced his kindness and acknowledged his virtues. He would never, indeed, confess that his friends had ever had occasion to vindicate any one circumstance of his conduct, or that he had ever been attacked either by envy or by civil or religious faction. His company was equally agreeable to all classes of society: young and old, rich and poor listened with pleasure to his conversation; for although he was deeply learned he had the happy art of delivering his sentiments upon all subjects without the slightest appearance of superiority.'

Those who intend to lecture on the *Pilgrim's Progress*, or even to read it intelligently, should first look into a booklet called *Whence? Whither?* written by Constance Nankivell (Allenson; 6d. net).

Peter, James, and John are the *Three Comrades of Jesus* of whom the Rev. Albert D. Watson gives his well-considered appreciation in one of Messrs. Allenson's 'Heart and Life Booklets' (1s. net).

The Great White Trail is the title of a little book for boys written by the Rev. F. T. Salter, B.A. (Allenson; 9d. net). It is written in language which boys will read; it has thoughts in it which will be for their salvation.

Train the children in observation and train them in imagination, but especially train them in imagination. The Rev. George Critchley's new book, *The Legend of the Sanctuary Flowers*, will serve (Allenson; 5s. net). Some of it will be best after good progress has been made, some will do to start with.

'The Science student learns that, however much he may wish a thing to be true, his wishing will not make it so; and also that, if he attempts to run counter to natural laws, those laws will assert their predominance in the end. In other words, he begins to learn what is surely the great lesson of all Science, namely, that the conditions under which we live may be controlled by knowledge, but cannot be subverted by ignorance. To take but a single example: it was ignorance, the self-sufficient ignorance of people in high places, which was directly responsible for the terrible mortality among our soldiers during the Crimean war; and it was the willingness of people in high places to be guided by knowledge that conferred upon the Japanese armies in Manchuria an immunity from disease and mortality such as had never before been experienced in warfare. Bearing this great fact in mind, our army medical service set to work during the early stages of the great war and overcame such diseases as typhoid fever, tetanus, and trench fever. But, even now, most of the heads of the medical profession are more interested in,

and give their chief attention to, chronic and incurable diseases, such as cardiac disease, diabetes, and nephritis, than to common fevers; and yet it is practically certain that it is to an "infection" in early life with one of the epidemic fevers that incurable diseases are often traceable. If the medical profession would only make a systematic search for the germ of influenza, of measles, of scarlet fever, of whooping-cough, and of rheumatic fever, cures for these pestilential diseases might perhaps be found. At present there is nothing even remotely resembling a cure for any one of them. Medicine, as distinguished from surgery, is sadly lacking in Scientific Method. "Research does not pay."'

The passage is worth quoting. For it is not the medical profession only that requires the use of the scientific method. In theology research is as necessary as in physical science, and as remunerative. Not in big stipends, but in the character that is wrought by discipline. And in theology as in science it is by the use of the scientific method that our great gains have been made these thirty years or more. The Bible is a new book to us, as Bishop Ryle pointed out in these pages a few months ago. And how? By the use of the scientific method. So when Mr. F. W. Westaway issues a new edition of his book on *Scientific Method* (Blackie; 10s. 6d. net), it behoves us all—philosophers, scientists, theologians—to give it our special attention.

What is scientific method? It is induction. It is gathering the facts first and then drawing the conclusions. It is working from below upwards, not from above downwards. It is saying, not this is so and let us see what follows, but let us see what this is, and then what follows.

The Rev. F. A. M. Spencer, M.A., author of *The Revival of Christianity* (Blackwell; 1s. 6d. net), holds that a thorough change is taking place in our religious thinking. We are no longer to endeavour after salvation from the fear of Hell. We are to give ourselves to service for the Kingdom of God.

The authors of *Materials for the Study of the Apostolic Gnosis* (Blackwell; 15s. net) are the Rev. Thomas Simcox Lea, D.D., Vicar of St. Austell, and Mr. Frederick Bligh Bond, F.R.I.B.A., author of 'The Gate of Remembrance.' They believe that they have discovered a proof of the Resurrection of our Lord and of other early events in the history of Christianity, a proof of a gnostic character, which has hitherto been unknown or disregarded.

The Gospel story was presented at the beginning in two forms, one simple and suitable for beginners, the other symbolic and fitted only for adults. One —to quote their own words—'was the "sincere milk of the Word" spoken of by the Apostle, and it is provided for those who are as babes in the Faith. This was rightly offered by the Church to all converts from heathendom in the early days, but for the instructed there was the solid nourishment which was ordained to satisfy the advanced Christian. And this could only be imparted by those who had the apostolic gift of the Gnosis.'

Now this gnosis, they say, was conveyed to the advanced Christian mathematically. Each word had a certain value numerically, obtained by reckoning up the value of its separate letters. 'The Greek language, which is the appointed vehicle for the transmission to us of the Christian Mysteries, is the most perfect instrument yet devised for the expression of inspired thought, since not only is it superabundantly rich in its vocabulary and choice of terms, but, as can now for the first time be shown, it enables the scribe under the inspiration of the Spirit, to give effect to the most intimate spiritual meanings by the perfect union of letter and number which subsists in it.'

This idea is worked by the authors through words, phrases, and even sentences with results which it will take some courage to attribute to mere accident. The matter is at any rate worth looking into, especially when we see what the writers of the book claim to be able to prove by means of their discovery.

We do not know that we have ever had a more courageous book or, curiously enough, a more clearly written and convincing book, than *Some Ethical Questions of Peace and War* (Burns & Oates; 9s. net). The words are strong but they are well considered. The book is written by the Rev. Walter McDonald, D.D., Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. And its purpose is to show that the policy that is identified with nationalism in Ireland at the present moment—a policy, you must remember, which has the bishops behind it—is suicidal. Bishops, Professors, other great leaders,

all are named without hesitation and shown to be wholly in the wrong. For a man to do as this man has done out of the heart of Roman Catholic Ireland is a fact of immense significance as well as singular virtue. Do you say he has a Highland name? He anticipates you, and shows that he is Irish of the Irish. 'Let these islands do their best,' he says (this is out of the middle of the book),—'standing loyally back to back, dealing equal justice, man and master making equal sacrifice,—and still they will find it hard to live and keep their trade in the days that anyone can see coming. Let us pull against one another,—Labour against Employers, Briton against Irishman; each striving to get the other to bear more than his share of the common burthen,—and we are all sure to go down together. Should the trade of Britain fail,—as is but too possible,—I do not know how ours is to maintain itself. And I, for one, do not want the Self-Determination that is allowed to rule a bare cupboard and an empty purse.'

Professor J. P. Whitney, Gwatkin's successor in the Dixie Chair of Ecclesiastical History at Cambridge, has published his inaugural address. The subject is *The Study of Ecclesiastical History To-day* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 2s. 6d. net). After a word, well chosen, on each of his predecessors, he goes on to say that the great historians must be studied as well as the original sources; that the sorest need is for cheap text-books; and that sound scholarship is the true pontifex. 'There is one thing which I have learnt, even more, perhaps, at Cambridge than elsewhere: I have learnt that sound scholarship is a wonderful bridge-maker over streams of difference. I recall some discussions, for instance, of Reformation History where you cannot tell to what ecclesiastical camp the investigators belong. Scholarship has a brotherhood and a unity of its own, and in its pursuit one learns a tolerance which is a step to more.'

O Hana San is the title of a book published by the Church Missionary Society (2s. net), in which the story is told of a bright attractive Japanese girl who became a Christian. The local colour is so well *told* by Constance C. A. Hutchinson that it scarcely needs to be painted, yet there are coloured pictures by H. E. Payne as well as etchings by J. M. Muriel Carlile.

Since Professor J. H. Woods of Harvard and Mr. C. B. Runkle of Cambridge, Massachusetts, translated Paul Deussen's *Outline of the Vedanta System of Philosophy*, a translation has appeared in English of Deussen's whole 'System der Vedanta.' It is Dr. Geden's fine translation, published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark. That, however, is only an encouragement to the translators of the Outline to issue it in a new edition. For it is what it is called, an outline, and an outline is what every student has to start with. The new edition is published in an attractive binding at the Oxford University Press (2s. 6d. net).

The Moorhouse Lectures for 1917, delivered in Melbourne by the Rev. David J. Davies, M.A., have been published under the title of *The Church and the Plain Man*, and copies may be had at the Oxford University Press (5s. net).

The plain man (he calls him also 'the average man') is coming. In Australia he has come. And the question which Mr. Davies answers is, What is the Church to do with him? So far, in Australia, as elsewhere, we have lost hold of him. We had him as a child, we lost him as a youth, we have not got him again. Well, the first thing is to understand him.

Now 'the plain man is a man after all. As a man of the world he admires efficiency and progress, the current catchwords of business. Tangible and visible success appeals to him. Effective organization and good business management, healthy finances and "push" are taken as signs of a justified existence. The Church is not a business, but if it does its real business with energy and decision, the plain man is ready to respect it, and to see something in it. An active philanthropy always appeals to the plain man. The church that cares for the poor, houses the orphan, ministers to the sick, and makes life brighter and easier in slum areas, will not lack support from men who rarely go to public worship.'

That for the Church. Then for the clergy: 'As to the clergy, a high educational standard, earnestness and sincerity, personal self-sacrifice, and the halo of romance that adorns devoted idealism, arouse a response in the plain man's mind and heart, for he, as a human being, is susceptible to the personal touch, and can appreciate and absorb truth when it is presented to him, not as an abstract proposition, but through

personality in word, deed, and life, that is, in purity and nobility of character.'

What does the plain man desire for himself? Three things: first a religion that can help him, next a religion that comes with authority, and then a religion that has reality, especially the reality of holiness.

It is astonishing how much a careful scholar can put into a primer. You can read the primer on *The Gospel and the Epistles of St. John*, by the Rev. James Alexander Robertson, M.A. (T. & T. Clark; 9d. net), in a short hour, and you wonder if anything has been left out and why everything is so fresh. It is the gift of scholarship, of style, of consecration. Mr. Robertson (who is United Free Church Minister at Ballater on Deeside) made a reputation by his first book. This little book will give his reputation a still wider and more intimate acceptance.

Professor Alexander R. Gordon, who writes a primer at the same time on *The Prophetical Literature of the Old Testament* (T. & T. Clark; 9d. net), has an already established reputation both as a scholar and as a popular expositor. Neither he nor Mr. Robertson has given us what some flippant reviewer once called 'pemmican'; it is fresh food, delicious and desirable, and not too much of it.

Mr. Edward Grubb, M.A., has brought into one volume two years' issues of his 'Bible Notes,' the issues for 1911 and 1912. They deal with the Person of Christ, one in the New Testament, the other in Post-Biblical thought. The title is *Christ in Christian Thought* (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net).

Two strong courses of lectures are contained in *The Life Here and the Life Hereafter* (James Clarke & Co; 6s. net). The preacher is the Rev. John Waddell, B.A., Minister of Egremont Presbyterian Church. The first course, consisting of twelve sermons, is on 'Problems of the Present Life'; the second course of ten is on 'Problems of the Future Life.'

For the present life the topics are: the Child, the Youth, Woman, Intemperance, Luxury and Waste, Patriotism, the Vote, the Right to Live, Business, Industrial Relations, Is the Church out-of-Date? a League of Nations.

In the second course the topic of most popularity is spiritualism. Two quotations go to the heart of the matter. One is from Mr. T. W. Rolleston: 'On the whole we seem to get in this field of inquiry precisely what the medium has to give us and no more. Of anything like a new spiritual wisdom there is never a trace. Does this not suggest an answer to the problem why spiritualism has not proved more acceptable as a response to man's craving for commerce with the unseen? Is it not because this craving is at bottom concerned with far other things than lost property or sealed messages or even the well-being of those dear to us? Is it not really the longing to catch some ray of divine light, to learn some ethic based on a wider and profounder vision, to feel ourselves even for a moment in communion with a love and a wisdom loftier than those of earth? This is just what spiritualism has entirely failed to give.' The other is from Sir William Barrett: 'None will find in automatic writing or other spiritualistic phenomena the channel for the "Communion of Saints," which is independent of material agency and attained only in stillness and serenity of soul.'

Professor Gilbert Murray has written a booklet on the League of Nations. *The Covenant Explained* is its title (Educ. Pub. Co., 9 Southampton Street, Holborn, W.C.). It costs one shilling, and a right well-spent shilling that will be. Every copy contains three application forms for membership.

A substantial volume on *The Person of Christ and His Presence in the Lord's Supper* has been published by Mr. Richard D. Badger at the Gorham Press in Boston, U.S.A. ($1.50 net). The author is the Rev. Jeremiah Zimmerman, D.D., LL.D.

Dr. Zimmerman 'was appointed in January 1918 to deliver at Gettysburg the Holman Lecture for that year on Article Tenth of the Augsburg Confession. Later, he was urged to publish the same with important additions in book form. The result of the study is this volume, which is sent forth with the earnest prayer and hope that it may tend to increase our faith in the historical incarnation of the Divine One in Christ; that our fellowship with the personal Christ may become more real by discerning His Presence in the Lord's Supper; that in this Holy Communion there may be

developed and realized the spirit of genuine love for the Church universal; so that whilst we may not all be able to think and express ourselves exactly alike,—though holding fast to the Divine Christ, we may all be able to love one another, even as He hath loved us, and as He hath enjoined and commanded us to love one another.'

This is Article X. of the Augsburg Confession: 'In regard to the Lord's Supper, they teach that the body and blood of Christ are truly present, and are dispensed to the communicants in the Lord's Supper; and they disapprove those who teach otherwise.' And that is Dr. Zimmerman's position. He holds that he and the Article are in agreement with the Thirty-Nine Articles and even with the Council of Trent—until that Council 'ventured to explain their positive statement by declaring the doctrine of Transubstantiation in these words: "this holy Synod doth now declare it anew, that, by the consecration of the bread and of the wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; which conversion is, by the Holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called Transubstantiation."'

Reunion and Recognition suggests the life to come, but it is ecclesiastical reunion and the recognition of ordination that Dr. P. T. Forsyth discusses in the pamphlet with that title (Headley; 9d. net).

Another of Messrs. Headley's pamphlets must be rescued from the fate that so often befalls pamphlets in this land. It is a right suggestive and moving discourse on the use of Love in fulfilling the prayer 'Thy kingdom come.' The writer is the Rev. Eric Hayman, B.A.

There has been issued the tenth edition, 'entirely revised and enlarged right up to date,' of Mr. Laurence M. Gibson's *The New Handbook for Literary and Debating Societies* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net).

'What is the outstanding feature of modern Society? Unquestionably it is *social disintegration*, seen in the separation of rich and poor, and the growth of social caste and class feeling.'

So says the Rev. David Watson, D.D., and the saying is the centre of his book on *The Social Expression of Christianity* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). Now disintegration is a big mouthful, and there is a risk of its becoming as blessed as Mesopotamia or Democracy. But Dr. Watson watches his words well. You will find no soothing repetitions in him. He is one of our most outspoken and whole-hearted advocates of a social Christianity. And he has come at a good time. He does not ignore the individual, but he gives him only a third of the whole consideration. 'Christ,' he says, 'is related to society in at least three ways: first, through the individuals who compose it, for He revealed the eternal value of the individual soul; second, through the Christian conception of the Kingdom of God as the social ideal; and third, through the direct bearing His teaching has upon the problems of society.'

How many besides the Rev. G. A. Studdert Kennedy would have sent out a volume with the title *Lies*! (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net)? The book, as the title, is plainness of speech from first to last. A spade is called a spade, except when it is called a damned spade. For this former padre, now vicar, uses the language of the trenches out of sympathy with the men whom he believes to be the victims of lies. He finds lies everywhere, and he wants to kill them one by one. 'It's the only way to deal with lice, and it's the only way to deal with lies.' He finds them everywhere, we say. Indeed, the only truth he seems to have discovered is the truth of the psalmist's saying, 'I said in my haste that all men are liars.' He finds them—but we need not make selections.

What does he propose to do? He proposes to give every liar 'a firm faith in life eternal.' Nothing less and nothing else will do. And he proposes to do it by getting men and women, and most of all little children, 'to pray continually, to commune with God, to worship God.' For he sees that they all acknowledge their duty to man. They recognize the obligation of the second commandment; they do not recognize the existence of the first.

Another volume has been published of Lieut. Coningsby Dawson's letters. It carries the story of the war from the entry of the Americans to the end. The title is *Living Bayonets* (Lane; 6s. net). It is the correspondence of an eminent writer who has the special gift of letter-writing.

Scene after scene is sketched for us in memorable vividness. There are few letters without the record of some moving incident. One striking fact is brought out by the reading of the book right through; the author gradually passes from admiration of the Germans to amusement, to dislike, to hatred, to disgust. The last letters are terrible in their loathing. 'Judas, the front-rank assassin of all times, set an example in decency which it would behove Germany to follow, when he went out into the garden and hanged himself.'

The War Romance of the Salvation Army (Lippincott; 6s. net), even though it is only the Salvation Army of America, is not soon told. Miss Grace Livingston Hill, inspired by Miss Evangeline Booth, the Commander-in-Chief in America, has taken 358 pages to it. Yet it reads as if it were written at a sitting. The style is the author's (or shall we say the Army's?) own, and it is maintained in all its glow and go to the very end. The 'lassies' are 'lassies' and 'lovely lassies,' and the pies and the cakes and above all the doughnuts are as 'lovely' (to another sense) as the 'lassies.' And you feel yourself one of a truly charming company who did well and deserved all the joy they had in the doing.

It was not all fun. Oh no. 'It was very still in the mess hall as the two lovely lassies took their guitars and began to sing. There was something so strong and sweet and pure in the glance of their blue eyes, the set of their firm little chins, so pleasant and wholesome and merry in the very curve of their lips, that the men were hushed with respect and admiration before this highest of all types of womanhood.

'It was a song written by their Commander that the girls had chosen, with a sweet, touching melody, and the singers made every word clear and distinct:

Bowed beneath the garden shades,
Where the Eastern sunlight fades,
Through a sea of grief He wades,
And prays in agony.
His sweat is of blood,
His tears like a flood
For a lost world flow down.
I never knew such tears could be—
Those tears He wept for me!

Hung upon a rugged tree
On the hill of Calvary,
Jesus suffered death, to be
The Saviour of mankind.
His brow pierced by thorn,
His hands and feet torn,
With broken heart He died,
I never knew such pain could be,
This pain He bore for me!

'Suddenly crashing into the midst of the melody came a great shell, exploding just outside the door and causing everyone at the table to spring to his feet. The singers stopped for a second, wavered, as the reverberation of the shock died away, and then went on with their song; and the officers, abashed, wondering, dropped back into their seats marvelling at the calmness of these frail women in the face of death. Surely they had something that other women did not have to enable them to sing so unconcernedly in such a time as this!

Love which conquered o'er death's sting,
Love which has immortal wing,
Love which is the only thing
My broken heart to heal.
It burst through the grave,
It brought grace to save,
It opened Heaven's gate.
I never knew such love could be—
This love He gave to me!'

How do we understand *The Divinity of Christ* now? The answer is brief enough and intelligible enough as given by Canon Vernon F. Storr in the latest issue of the Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications (Longmans; 2s. net).

In issuing an abridged edition of the F. W. H. Myers' *Human Personality* (Longmans; 6s. 6d. net), the editors, S. B. and L. H. M., do not mention that an abridged edition was issued in 1907. They mention only the original edition in two volumes. But they cannot have forgotten it, for it was edited and abridged by one of the present editors, Myers' son, Leopold Hamilton Myers.

The new edition has two advantages. It is shorter than the other and it is cheaper. Much was cut away from the original book in the first abridgment, and it was a better book in consequence. This is the best book of the three.

Trothyonityuncongcor—what is that? It is a familiar sound to the ordinary English worshipper. It is the way in which a phrase of the Prayer for the Church in the Order of the Holy Communion is uttered by many Anglican priests. The phrase as printed in the Prayer Book is 'truth, unity and concord.'

It is an example, a terrifying example, of what careless enunciation comes to. There is so much careless enunciation in *The Conduct of Public Worship*, that the Rev. F. H. J. Newton, B.A., has written a book about it which has been published by Messrs. Longmans under that title (5s. net). He who has to conduct a non-liturgical service is apt to envy the priest who simply 'reads out of his book.' But here is a volume every sentence of which is used to show that the reading out of the book demands natural ability, training, and sleepless watchfulness.

It is well known that the Rev. Peter Green, Rector of St. Philip's, Salford, and Canon of Manchester, is a successful pastor; it is not so well known that he can show other men the way. But a reading of his Pastoral Theology Lectures at Cambridge and King's College, London, will reveal it. The word 'practical' is rarely used by him, but it is in the reader's mind throughout. Ideas and ideals are plentiful, but they are always set to work: if they will not work they are set aside. For this business is the King's and it requires haste.

And yet, if there is anything that Canon Green urges more earnestly than another, it is not to let haste outrun discretion: if there is any man with whom he is himself impatient it is the impatient young curate or vicar. For there is the haste that recognizes the urgency of the work, and there is the haste that recognizes nothing.

Canon Green enters into all the details of parish work and writes out of a long successful experience. The title is *The Town Parson* (Longmans; 6s. net).

Mr. Charles Whibley has published a volume of *Literary Studies* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net). It contains three chapters of varied information but uniform entertainment on the Chroniclers and Historians of the Tudor Age, Tudor Translators, and Rogues and Vagabonds of Shakespeare's Time. In the last of the three we light unexpectedly upon Falstaff, and perceive his superiority over Poins and Bardolph—a hero of poetry he, they of the street and the highway.

Then comes a critical, somewhat stinging, essay on Sir Walter Ralegh. It is followed by one on the Court Poets of the days of Pepys, and that by one on Congreve and some others. The most curious and minute study in the volume is of the parodists who arose on the introduction of Scarron into this country, and the satirists who followed Samuel Butler's *Hudibras*—Cotton, Ned Ward, Tom Brown, and company. It is a picture of a society of letters which surely will be seen but once in this world. Yet it is a descensus which some say we were even lately heading for, when we were rescued by that other hell, the European war.

The last essay is an apologetic for Dean Swift. It is the attack of Macaulay and still more of Thackeray that have sent Mr. Whibley into the lists. And he lays about him with right goodwill. His chief weapon of defence is Swift's capacity for friendship. But why is Swift still so bitterly attacked? For his irony most of all. Even yet we do not understand irony, and as all the unknown is feared we dread it.

A book on Prayer, its practice not its theory, is *In touch with the Throne*, written by the Rev. James Little, D.D. (Marshall; 3s. 6d.). The man who prays well is not always able to discuss the theory of prayer, but he can show other men how to pray. This Dr. Little does.

Sir A. Conan Doyle's book *The New Revelation* is subjected to a sympathetic but searching criticism in a volume entitled *The Vital Choice: Endor or Calvary?* (Morgan & Scott; 2s. net). The author is Lieut.-Col. D. Forster, C.B.E., D.S.O., R.E.

Short addresses intended for steadying and strength are offered by the Rev. J. Taylor, B.D. in *Cameos of Comfort* (Morgan & Scott; 3s. net). They are mostly attached to texts, of which they sometimes give a helpful exposition. But the end is never out of sight—consolation for those who are sufferers by the war. Mr. Taylor had much experience and he touches with a gentle hand.

The Rev. J. C. Carlile, D.D., has gathered into a volume some of the addresses which he delivered in Canada and the United States during the war. The title is *Vision and Vocation* (Morgan & Scott;

4s. net). The addresses are fresh in thought and clear in construction. For the most part Dr. Carlile is attracted by texts with a breath of poetry in them. In the last of all the text is Is 61^3, 'Beauty for ashes.'

What do ashes stand for? In the Old Testament for four things—human frailty, humiliation, grief, and defeat. The word 'beauty' should be 'garland of flowers.' So the idea is that a garland of flowers will be given as power for frailty, as honour for humility, as joy for grief, as victory for defeat. The whole conception is worked out quickly, and the sermon ends with a sense of those very things being received or at least ready for our acceptance.

The Rev. Anthony C. Deane, M.A., has issued a reprint of his charming booklet *A Library of Religion* (Mowbray; 1s. 6d. net). There is no change. The prices of some of the books recommended have changed, but then, as Mr. Deane truly (and we hope hopefully) says, the chances are that if corrections were made now these corrections would soon be incorrect. We could criticise the book. Who could not? One comprehensive criticism is enough now: Fewer books and fuller.

If *Pictures and Stories from Animal Life* (R.T.S.; 4s. 6d. net) should be given to the little ones (not, however, the very least yet) to read as they can and look at the pictures which are so beautifully and accurately drawn by Margaret J. D. Badenoch, they will quite unconsciously store up information which will be good to remember all their lives. And more, they will learn to love all things both great and small—nay, even perhaps that great God who made and loves them all.

But a more original R.T.S. book is Lily Sandford's *Through a Reed Frame* (7s. 6d. net). This is the plan of it. A page occurs at the beginning made up of small coloured pictures which together tell a biblical story. Afterwards a large picture is seen with a boy looking at a space in it. That space is to be filled with one of the small pictures cut out and pasted on. Another picture comes with another space separated off. All the while the letterpress is making matters clear. After a time come questions with space for their answers. But the wise mother will make herself and her boys a present of the book and then——.

In *Historic Struggles for the Faith* (Sands; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. John Gabriel Rowe has told the story of some Roman Catholic martyrs and movements in the history of our own land. He is well acquainted with his subject. He catches at admissions made by Protestants and uses them effectively.

One most useful feature of Dr. Alfred Plummer's Commentaries is that they are up to date. That does not mean only that he appeals to the modern mind. It means also that he has read and considered the latest relevant literature. No doubt there are scholars who do this and disappear under the billows of their learning. Dr. Plummer keeps his head above water. Every point of importance in the original he considers in the light of all that has been written before, and with his own clear practical experienced judgment he comes to his own conclusions.

Another feature is the new translation. It is a free rendering, its purpose being to place the English reader as nearly as possible in the position of the *first* readers' notice. For the first writers and the first readers used the ordinary language of their day.

The new book is *A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (Scott; 7s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Simpkin, Marshall & Co. are the publishers of a booklet on the income tax. Its title is *Income Tax Simplified* (1s. 6d. net). The author is Mr. Arthur Fieldhouse. In your distress try it. There is no iniquity in it, but much clear thinking and good advising.

Causes and Consequences (Simpkin, Marshall; 2s. 6d. net) is a very bad title for a very good book. The author, Mr. G. Gordon Samson, writes for Labour, and shows how easy it is for Labour to go astray regarding wages, wealth, the land, and other things, and how disastrous 'to the greater number' persistent misunderstanding will be.

In an introductory note to *The Church Catechism Revised*, by the Rev C. L. Feltoe, D.D. (Skeffingtons; 1s. net), there occurs this sentence by Canon A. W. Robinson: 'What seems now to be most needed is that we should all of us be helped to understand, with equal clearness, that the Church can only live and do its work truly, as it constantly remembers that it is not an end in

itself, but the appointed means whereby mankind is to be prepared for the speedy coming of the Kingdom of God.'

Mrs. M. Hardy dedicates her new volume of essays, *The Embroidery of Quiet* (Skeffingtons; 4s. net), 'to the Memory of Theodore Bayley Hardy, V.C., D.S.O., M.C., Honorary Chaplain to the King, C.F., 37th Division.' They are quite unique as essays. There is no instruction—not a single scientific fact. There is no artistry—not a landscape nor a seascape, not a river nor a rose. There is no theology. Truth, beauty, goodness, we say, that is the sum of life: then there is no life here. And yet it is just life that is here. But it is life as a whole, not broken into aspects. Sorrow is not separated from joy, pleasure is not felt to-day, pain to-morrow. We do not obey the body to forget the soul, or serve the soul to neglect the body. What differences life brings are differences in life itself, not in its accidents.

'*Daughter.* It's a confession, but I have long suspected that I reign over, but do not govern my hopes. My soul still remains perplexingly young, hopeful.

'*Mother.* Are you surprised? I am not. For the soul by its very essence is ever young.

'Listen, listen while I tell you; the body is born young, and grows old, but the soul is born old, and grows young.

'This is the secret that the old have no power to tell to the young.'

Students of Christianity, whether Biblical or Ecclesiastical, owe an imperishable debt to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Month by month the Society issues books that are of the utmost importance for their studies, and in a form that is both convenient and scholarly. There are books in series and there are books by themselves.

Of the latter is an edition of *The Officium and Miracula of Richard Rolle of Hampole.* It is edited by the Rev. R. M. Woolley, D.D. (5s. net). The introduction is a biography of the hermit—the biography of a most eccentric and successful follower of Christ.

The Epistles of Ignatius have been published in Greek, with introductions, as one of the S.P.C.K. 'Texts for Students' (1s. net). The editor is the Rev. T. W. Crafer, D.D.

If you want to discover a man's bias set him to write a book on *The Emperor Julian.* The Rev. Edward J. Martin, B.D., in his very informing Select Bibliography tells us on which side every writer is to be placed: Alice Gardner in the *Heroes of the Nations*—too friendly; Gaetano Negri—a popular attempt to rehabilitate Julian; P. Allard—too hostile, but the only work to be put beside Gibbon. And so he himself, in his book with that title (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net) is on the watch. He has written such a sketch of the emperor's life and policy as we may rest upon with some confidence. His considerateness does not lessen his grip of fact or of opinion. But he gives fact along with opinion every time.

Take note of the following pamphlets issued by the S.P.C.K.: (1) *What the Church has done for Education*, by D. M. Champion, B.A. (4d. net); (2) *Christianity and Democracy*, by S. P. T. Prideaux, D.D. (6d. net); (3) *What is the Gospel?* by H. L. Goudge, D.D. (4d. net); (4) *The Training of the Clergy*, by H. Maynard Smith (6d. net); (5) *Administrative Reform*, by the same (6d. net); *Christianity and Slavery*, by Arthur H. Tabrum (1s. 3d. net).

Mr. J. H. Harris has written a most instructive book on Africa. Mr. Harris is Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Aborigines Protection Society, and his interest is chiefly in the labour question. He calls his book *Africa: Slave or Free?* (S.C.M.; 6s. net). But he has given an account of the conditions of native life all round, and that so vividly that we read the book from cover to cover, and then wish some one would write just its fellow on Asia and America.

Very many are the social problems of Africa and very difficult—labour, race, sex, religion; every great social fact seems to rise into acuteness. Mr. Harris sees one thing clearly, that the only way to their solution is the Christian way. But he would have the missionary act wisely and in harmony. Thus:

'The question of polygamy in Africa is one of real urgency for the forces of Christianity. Agreement is probably impossible upon every detail, but there should be general support for main principles. Any violent breaking down of polygamy which involves injustice to and the degradation of certain wives cannot be tolerated. The denial of Church membership to the polygamist at the time

of conversion cannot be defended upon scriptural grounds, and should therefore be abandoned. Monogamy, being the ideal state for social and spiritual peace and enjoyment, should be the condition of holding office in any Christian Community. Given the acceptance of these three broad principles, much of the irritating detail of to-day would vanish from the troubled vision of the African.'

At the Swarthmore Press is published *Letters from India*, by J. S. H. (2s. net). There are two parts. The first part is a missionary's impressions of needs and methods; the second is the record of a missionary's rescue work during the influenza epidemic of last year. The facts are fresh and sometimes alarming.

What is the Christian Ideal? There are ideals, of course, like justice, mercy, love. But there is one ideal. What is that? The Rev. William E. Wilson, B.D., will tell you. Mr. Wilson has written a book with that title: *The Christian Ideal* (Swarthmore Press; 5s. net). He defines the ideal as 'a constantly developing life, always enlarging its powers and scope by harmonious co-operation in a society organically one under the complete control of God.'

Is there not a single name for it? Its name is the Kingdom of God. And Mr. Wilson's book is really an up-to-date exposition of what is understood by that phrase. Could he have written on a more timely topic? He could not. It is also difficult to see how he could have written more helpfully.

A book on *Social Ideals in India* has been issued by the United Council for Missionary Education (1s. 3d. net). The author, Mr. William Paton, answers to the name of 'globe-trotter,' but he has been watchful and he has read widely.

So rare a thing is a new book of mysticism that one opens *The Golden Fountain; or, The Soul's Love of God* (Watkins; 3s. net), with some hesitation. There is no author's name. The claim is quite modest: 'Being some Thoughts and Confessions of One of His Lovers.' Moreover, there is an occasional dash of curious psychology: 'Correspondence with the Divine is accomplished for the creature through the heart and by the uppermost part of the breast, this latter place (above the heart and below the mind) is the dwelling-place of the celestial spark of the soul, which lies, as it were, between two fires—that of the heart and that of the mind, responding directly to neither of these, but to God only.' Again, it is the record of an experience that is quite normal and quite modern in expression. And yet it is a book of true mystical devotion. The writer has through much tribulation washed her robes and made them white even while here on earth, and enjoys the rapture of the saints. She has no visions, but she has ecstasies, for the soul, 'whilst she is able to maintain this most difficult height of contemplation, may be visited by an intensely vivid perception, inward vision, and knowledge of God's attributes or perfections, very brief; and this *as a gift*, for she is not able to will such a felicity to herself, but being given such she is instantly consumed with adoration, and *enters ecstasy*.'

In 1902 Sir G. G. Greenwood published *The Faith of an Agnostic*. Now at the end of these seventeen years he issues the book again (Watts; 12s. 6d. net). He has rewritten a good deal of it and made many additions. But it would have been better if he had written a new book—not because he has greatly changed his mind, but because the things to which his mind then applied itself are no longer the things which most concern us. Some problems are of course with us always. But even on them Sir G. G. Greenwood should have written anew. For they change their aspect as time passes. Huxley and Herbert Spencer were much talked of in their day and talked much, but who goes to the one for science now or to the other for philosophy? In this book we have Huxley and Spencer till we wish they were both, like Huxley's 'bathybius,' at the bottom of the sea. We have no grudge against these conscientious and contentious men, but they are out of date. At the beginning of the seventh chapter Sir G. G. Greenwood quotes a paragraph from Volney and begins the next with 'So wrote Volney at the beginning of the eighteenth century. What says the philosopher of to-day?' Whereupon there follows a long quotation from Herbert Spencer's 'First Principles,' just such a quotation as shows why Spencer and his philosophy are past.

It is a pity. For the author of this book is conscientious, fair-minded, and inoffensive. He

has courage too. He does not hesitate to contradict other agnostics. Of one of Leslie Stephen's proud theories, he says bluntly, 'I do not think the argument will "hold water."' In truth, he is something of a terror to his friends. For he will insist upon being religious and on the necessity of religion for every man, which is just the unpardonable sin in the eyes of the professional rationalist.

When Dr. W. Tudor Jones lectured to our Soldiers, Sailors, and Munition Workers in 1918 and 1919 he discovered that, as a rule, they did not know that they had minds. He found it necessary to prove to them that they had, and then show them how to use these minds of theirs. The demonstration of the fact that they really had minds interested them greatly, and fitted them somewhat for the difficult discipline of the use of them. Into *The Training of Mind and Will* (Williams & Norgate; 2s. 6d. net) Dr. Jones has boiled down many long lectures. And now we too may find out that we have minds and may wish to make some use of them.

An Aramaic Source for Acts i.–xv.

By the Reverend Charles Anderson Scott, D.D., Professor of the New Testament, Westminster College, Cambridge.

There is no book of the New Testament whose reputation in the judgment of scholars has changed so much in the last thirty years as that of the Acts of the Apostles. One looks back to one's student days, when Zeller's *Commentary* was the last word in criticism, and remembers how through the ruthless application of Baur's theory it left the Acts under a cloud of suspicion which deprived it of practically all historical authority and even usefulness. The remarkable change which has taken place in the interval may be measured by the treatment of the subject in Professor Kirsopp Lake's article in the *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*. There one notices the quiet ignoring of not a few critical positions which used to be taken as almost axiomatic, the careful weighing of probabilities in favour of historical accuracy, where the author used to be dismissed as an unblushing glozer of a painful situation, and in general a tone of respect for the document, which used to be conspicuously lacking in the work of advanced scholars. We owe much in this respect to a foreign scholar who has since become our enemy, more even to the learning, the indefatigable labour, and the candour of Sir William Ramsay, whose slow conversion to belief in Luke as the author, and as an honest and trustworthy authority, has made more impression than the defences advanced by those who never knew a doubt.

The history of criticism as applied to the Acts has entered on a new phase since the publication in 1916 of Professor Torrey's special study on the composition and date of Acts.[1] Professor Torrey is well known through his previous contributions to Semitic scholarship, and especially to the problems of Ezra and Nehemiah. He broke ground in this field of New Testament criticism with an essay on 'The Translations made from the Original Aramaic Gospels,' which he contributed to a volume presented to Professor C. H. Toy.[2] The thesis of this essay was that, especially in the earlier chapters of his Gospel, Luke employed Aramaic originals, and shows himself 'an accomplished translator.' In the present work he carries the same thesis a stage further, and seeks to show that in Ac $1–15^{35}$ we are to recognize the translation of a document originally written in Aramaic, found and translated by Luke between 62 and 64 A.D., and to be interpreted in some of its most difficult passages through the recognition of mistakes or too literal renderings in the translation.[3]

[1] *The Composition and Date of Acts*, by Charles Cutler Torrey, Professor of Semitic Languages in Yale University: No. 1 of 'Harvard Theological Studies.' Oxford University Press, 1916, 72 pp.

[2] *Studies in the History of Religion, Presented to Crawford Howell Toy*. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1912.

[3] The theory is not referred to by Prof. Kirsopp Lake, and by inference he may be said to reject it: 'It is more probable here [c. 3] than anywhere else in Acts that we are dealing with traces of a written Greek document underlying Acts in the same way as Mark and Q underlie the Lucan Gospel' (*D.A.C.* i. 23).

The idea that there is an Aramaic source or sources at the back of the early chapters of Acts was suggested by Nestle (1896), commended as probable by Harnack (1908), and is referred to as possible by Dr. Moffatt in his *Introduction*. It is now taken up by Professor Torrey, and worked out with much care and fulness of illustration, and also with much clearness and felicity of style.

It may be well to state at once the point which is really at issue. It is commonly recognized that the first part of Acts is marked by a number of locutions which are Semitic in character. In the second half the Semitisms are by comparison few and unimportant. The question is, Are these Semitic features to be explained as due to Luke's familiarity with the Greek text of the Septuagint, itself marked by such survivals from the original Hebrew text, or do they provide evidence that he was translating from an Aramaic document, translating from a language in which he was not perfectly at home, and translating with a slavish preciseness which sometimes caused him to make mistakes? 'The truth is,' says Dr. Torrey, contending for the latter view, 'that the language of all these fifteen chapters is translation-Greek through and through, generally preserving even the order of words. In the remainder of the book, chapters 16–28, the case is altogether different. Here there is no evidence of an underlying Semitic language. The few apparent Semitisms are chargeable to the Koiné, though their presence may be due in part to the influence of the translation-Greek which Luke had so extensively read and written' (p. 7). In confirmation of this distinction Dr. Torrey adduces the 'really startling' contrast between the two halves of the book in respect of the formal citations from the Old Testament. In the earlier half we find (according to Nestle's text) eighty-three such citations: in the second half only four, one of which may be a report of what Paul himself said (p. 57).

From these general considerations Dr. Torrey proceeds to examine the text of the first half of Acts, adducing in the first place 'some specially striking examples of mistranslation,' six in all (2^{47}, 3^{16}, 4^{24}, 8^{10}, $11^{27\text{-}30}$, 15^{7}). He rightly points out that all of these represent real *cruces interpretum*, and in several of the cases his solution based on re-translation into Aramaic is both welcome and plausible. One or two examples may be given. In 2^{47}, where the very difficult ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό appears in the critical editions (in place of τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ substituted by perplexed copyists), Dr. Torrey concludes that the phrase is Luke's rendering of an Aramaic equivalent for σφόδρα, and taking the prefixed *lamed* to signify an indirect instead of a direct object, gets as the original form: 'The Lord added greatly day by day to the saved.' And, further, he finds an explanation of Luke's mistranslation here in the fact that 'the use of the word laḥda to mean "greatly" is a peculiarity of the Judæan dialect, not likely to be familiar to a native of Antioch. It is to be presumed, however, that Luke knew Greek at least as well as he knew Aramaic; and however slavish his habit of translation, it is not likely that he would write what would be meaningless for his Greek readers. It seems to me that the right translation of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό here (whatever it may be in earlier passages) is 'thereunto'; and the meaning either 'to the same place' (in harmony with the sustained emphasis on the gatheredness of the new community) or more probably 'to the same society' (Weizsäcker: ihrer Vereinigung). In the latter case we might have a reflexion of the period when the new community had not yet taken to itself the name of *ecclesia*, and the writer was at a loss for a word to describe it.

In 3^{16} Dr. Torrey's method provides a welcome and satisfactory emendation of a text which perplexes both by its form and by its apparent meaning. 'And by faith in his name hath his name made this man strong . . . yea, the faith which is through him hath given him this perfect soundness before you all.' Apart from the 'intolerably awkward and confused' character of the Greek, there seems to be a double and inconsistent explanation of the cure; it is ascribed on the one hand to 'the faith which is through Jesus,' and on the other to a certain quasi-magical power in the name of Jesus. On retranslation, however, a sentence is disclosed in which very slight alterations in the pointing give a much more satisfactory form to the statement: 'And by faith in his name he hath made strong this man.' Similarly on 11^{27} the suggestion is welcome and probable that the word οἰκουμένη, which has given rise to much learned discussion, stands for the Aramaic word which means equally 'earth' and 'land'; and that the author of this document, writing in Jerusalem, followed the time-honoured usage in calling Judea simply 'the land.' Obviously, however, this theory of translation from the Aramaic must await the judgment of competent

scholars of that language, of whom we have but few. Those who are interested will be well advised to look out for an early number of the *Journal of Theological Studies*.

These crucial cases are followed by a large number of minor examples drawn from cc. 1–15[35], at which point the writer finds the conclusion of the Aramaic source. From the way in which v.[36] dovetails into v.[35] he infers that in what follows (where the character of the language changes completely) Luke composed his narrative as a continuation of the original document; and confirms his opinion by a very interesting explanation of the discrepancy between 15[33] and 15[36. 40] as to the movements of Silas. 'Luke did not believe that Silas returned to Jerusalem as narrated in 15[33], but rather that he remained at Antioch until the time that he set out with Paul on the missionary journey. It would have been easy to omit v.[33], or to add a harmonizing statement, as some less scrupulous editor of the text has actually done in v.[34], which is now omitted from all critical editions. But Luke, as usual, gave his source the word, and would not falsify it' (p. 41, cf. p. 68).

The remoter consequences of this theory, if it could be established, are obvious, and of obvious importance. Torrey 'conjectures that the document came into Luke's hands either when Paul was in prison in Cæsarea, during which time Luke was very likely in Palestine, or—even more probably—after his arrival in Rome in the year 62.' He finds himself confronted, of course, by the same objections which have been felt by many who for different reasons have been inclined to set an early date for Acts. In particular, the Third Gospel must then have been written before 62, and Mark, at least one form of it, even earlier than that. But it has long been widely held as almost axiomatic that Luke's version of the apocalyptic discourse points indubitably to a date subsequent to the Fall of Jerusalem, and further that there is evidence of Luke's dependence upon Josephus, which must bring the date of the Gospel down to *circa* A.D. 92.

Both these points are vigorously dealt with by Dr. Torrey. On the first, after an examination of Lk 21[20-24], he claims that 'every particle of Luke's prediction not provided by Mark was furnished by familiar and oft-quoted Old Testament passages. It is therefore obviously not permissible to call Luke 21[20-24] a *vaticinium ex eventu*, and it cannot be cited as throwing light on the date of the Gospel.' On the second point the writer maintains that Luke's mistake about Theudas–Judas has not been derived from Josephus, where the correct account is given, but from some earlier document. 'Any history dealing with this period would have been pretty certain to mention Theudas and Judas at this point, and in this order, although the revolt under Judas really happened much earlier. From some history of the kind, in which the facts were not clearly stated, the author of Luke's Aramaic source obtained his wrong impression of the order of events.' This is, no doubt, a tenable explanation of the obvious reversal of the dates of Judas and Theudas, but Dr. Torrey appears to overlook the further difficulty that the revolt of Theudas must have taken place, according to Josephus, not earlier than A.D. 44, that is to say, some ten years later than the date of Gamaliel's speech. The 'literary device' whereby such speeches were written up by the narrator would need to be credited to the Aramaic author as it has been credited to Luke.

In the course of a discussion on the homogeneity of Acts, Dr. Torrey takes occasion to deal with the theories advanced by Norden in his *Agnostos Theos*, a work whose history provides a striking illustration of the somewhat hasty homage often paid to a famous scholar who enters another field than his own. The result is a piece of unusually trenchant and conclusive criticism, which should make future writers chary of appealing to Norden's authority in the matter. 'It is a pity that a work of such learning as the *Agnostos Theos* should be so marred by inaccurate statements and loose reasoning, especially when the problem in hand is such an important one.'

This very interesting contribution by Dr. Torrey to the problem of the Acts has hitherto met with much less attention in Britain than in America. There it has already given rise to widespread discussion. Among articles to be noted are those by Dr. B. W. Bacon in the *American Journal of Theology* (1918), by Dr. Foakes-Jackson in the *Harvard Theological Review* for 1917 (critical), and by Dr. W. J. Wilson in the same *Review* for October 1918. Wilson accepts Torrey's main con-

[1] Not otherwise Dr. Lake. 'It has usually been assumed that the date must be posterior to the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, but it is doubtful whether there are really any satisfactory proofs that this was the case' (*D.A.C.* i. 20).

clusions, and gives further illustrations of their application to the exegesis of the text. He also deals with the question of sources rather than a source for these chapters, in connexion with which Torrey's theory is likely to be criticized. He concludes that 'if the whole of Acts $1–15^{35}$ has been taken over literally from a single Aramaic document, then all the arguments based on the arrangement, structure, and arrangement of material remain as they were before.'

In the *American Journal of Theology*, of January 1919, will be found a further article by Professor Torrey, in which he deals with these criticisms, and widens out his study of the Acts into an interesting examination of some of the presuppositions which have for many years past governed much treatment of the subject. Here again he does good service in pricking a number of hypercritical bubbles. He makes great fun of the suggestion that because Luke was Paul's friend and companion in travel he must have shared his views. 'It would be quite possible, on the evidence of our sources, to argue that Luke had some distaste, not only for theology in general, but also for Paul's in particular.' For the verdict on his main contention as to the Aramaic origin of Acts 1–15 we must wait until the experts in that language have said their say; meanwhile, so cautious a scholar as B. W. Bacon gives his opinion that 'Torrey's earlier demonstration (the term is not too strong) is now supplemented by equally cogent proof that Acts $1–15^{35}$ is a translation from the Aramaic.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'The way of the just is uprightness.'—Pr 26^{7}.

NATIONS, like boys and girls, become united through admiring and loving the same people. Sometimes they only discover their mutual love when the loved one dies. We were friends with America before she came to help us in the Great War. We not only thought of her as a near relative, we had shaken hands over the grave of President Lincoln.

1. It is about this great man I want to speak to you. He was so great that it is difficult to say the things that will give you anything like a true estimate of him.

He was born in Harden County, Kentucky, on the 9th of February 1809. His home was a rough cabin made of logs and clay, with a bed, a few three-legged stools, a log table, a pot, a kettle, and a few tin cooking vessels, for furniture.

The mother was a remarkable woman. She was delicate, rather sad, and very sensitive, but a heroine in her own way. She was a God-fearing woman, and exercised a great influence over her boy Abe, as he was called. Unfortunately she died when he was only nine.

You can remember things that happened when you were that age, can't you? Abe never forgot his mother. Rough and ungainly he turned out to be when he was a grown lad, but his heart was soft and tender. Long afterwards, when he had become President of the United States, he said, 'All that I am, or ever hope to be, I owe to my sainted mother.'

Abe gathered a little library together in the log cabin. The books in it were *The Pilgrim's Progress*, *The Life of Washington*, *Robinson Crusoe*, and the *Bible*—a capital selection, surely. He learned to write by taking pieces of burnt sticks from the fire, and practising on the end of chopped logs. But he was very full of mischief. A neighbour for whom he did odd jobs said Abe was 'lazy, very lazy. He was always reading, scribbling, and such like.' And Abe himself knew that he was lazy. One can tell that from what he once wrote in a copy-book:

> Abraham Lincoln, his hand and pen,
> He will be good, but God knows when.

2. One day he heard a long word of which he did not know the meaning. It was the word 'demonstrate.' He went to a boy friend and asked him the meaning of it. The boy said he did not know, but he had seen it in a book called Euclid. Well, Abe succeeded in getting a copy of the book, and committed the whole of it to memory. You boys and girls may know nothing of Euclid, but those who had their schooldays

twenty or thirty years ago will understand how a knowledge of Euclid helped Lincoln to be clear and convincing in his statements, to be, in fact, logical.

All the time there was deep down in Abraham Lincoln's heart the desire to love and serve God. His mother had striven to foster this desire when he was a little boy. She taught him that God was always near, seeing him, and loving him, even when he did wrong. He made promises in those days—promises to God and to his mother that he would be good, and strive to serve the Master she served and loved. When he was quite a man and had taken up the question of Temperance Reform in America, he said, 'I made a solemn promise to my mother before her death that I would never use intoxicating drink as a beverage, and I consider that pledge as binding to-day as it was the day I gave it.'

But Abraham Lincoln found he could not keep his promises without prayer. With his sense of right, united to his great ability, he would have been a strong man among his fellows; but when in his difficulties he felt his own weakness and took refuge in praying to his Heavenly Father, he became Abraham Lincoln the great Christian.

3. He had to travel a long and rough road between the log cabin and the President's chair. He lived the life of a labouring man; became clerk, storekeeper, advocate, senator in succession, and then President. How slavery came to be abolished during his term of office is a long story. It is difficult indeed to say when he first came into contact with it. But we are told that when on a trip down the Mississippi he witnessed some of its horrors, 'he was silent, and looked very bad.' At another time he attended a slave market. Turning to his companions beside him, he said, 'Boys, let us get away from this. If ever I get a chance to hit that thing I will hit it hard.' And he did.

He had to fight not only the wrong itself, but the crooked ways of some of his opponents. 'Douglas does not care whether slavery is voted, up or down,' said Lincoln, 'but God cares, Humanity cares, and I care, and by God's help I shall not fail.'

When he spoke in public on the subject he said the sort of thing that went home. Clever and sane men would yield to his influence, swayed by his eloquence like corn in the wind. He could do anything with his audience. They would get up and yell and cheer like wild Indians. Listen, boys and girls, to the closing words of one of his great speeches. I know you will understand them, for you have had the education of the Great War. 'Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by menaces of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeons to ourselves. *Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it.*'[1]

When his hour of triumph came and the slave was made free, Abraham Lincoln, America's greatest President, fell by the hand of the assassin. But his spirit still lives—'his soul goes marching on.'

The common people especially had loved him. They mourned him as a father. To the negroes his passing was a great blow. 'Massa,' said an old darkey who was a barber, 'I can't shave you this morning. I dun know jes' what it is, but somethin' has gone wrong with Massa Linkum.' And war-worn veterans of the great Civil War broke down and sobbed like children when they learned that their great captain was dead.

In the midst of a great tumult in New York—50,000 men were in the streets—a voice rang out 'Fellow citizens! Clouds and darkness are round about Him. His pavilion is dark waters and thick clouds of the sky. Justice and judgment are the habitations of His throne. Fellow citizens! God reigns.'

So the torch of Lincoln was passed on, for the speaker was General Garfield, who afterwards became President.

And you boys and girls can endeavour to do your part in the world as he did his, by making one of his great mottoes yours:

I am nothing, but truth is everything.

Child of the boundless prairie, son of the virgin soil,
Heir to the bearing of burdens, brother to them that toil;
God and nature together shaped him to lead in the van,
In the stress of her wildest weather, when the Nation needed a Man.

Swift slip the years from their tether, centuries pass like a breath,
Only some lives are immortal, challenging darkness and death.

[1] J. A. Sharp, *Abraham Lincoln*, 106.

Hewn from the stuff of the martyrs, write on the star-dust his name,
Glowing, untarnished, transcendent, high on the records of Fame.[1]

Mirrors.

'A mirror.'—James 1[23].

The text to-day is one you all know. Perhaps the girls know it better than the boys, but I think the boys may have seen something like it occasionally. The girls use it to help them tie up their curls and put their hats on straight, the boys to flash light in somebody's face on a sunny day. Well now, I have almost told you the name of it. Yes, it is a mirror.

You will find the text in the first chapter of James, the twenty-third verse. The mirrors St. James knew were not very like ours. In those days they had no glass mirrors such as we have. Instead they used thin plates of polished metal. Generally these were of bronze, but some of the finest were of silver. You may imagine it was not quite so easy to get a clear reflexion of yourself in one of these as in the nice glass mirrors you have at home.

1. Now we all carry a mirror about with us—you, and I, and everybody else. It is called the mirror of the soul; and in that mirror we receive the reflexion of the things and the people and the happenings with which we are surrounded. We may not realize that we are carrying these reflexions, but other people see them in us. If you are very much in a friend's company you begin to adopt his way of speaking, his little tricks of manner, his habits, and thoughts, and ideas. Very likely you are not aware of it, but other people notice it.

Once the errand boys in a certain part of London began to whistle out of tune. At last somebody discovered that the bells of Westminster were slightly out of tune. Something had gone wrong with the chimes and there was discord in them. The boys did not know there was anything the matter with the peals and quite unconsciously they had copied them. And so you will copy the people you are most with, and you will borrow your thoughts very much from the books you read—almost without knowing it.

So you see it matters very much what kind of company we keep, and what kind of books we read, and what kind of games we play. And the strange thing about these magic mirrors of ours is that the younger we are the brighter they are, and the clearer and stronger are the reflexions. Therefore where we take our mirrors matters much more when we are young than when we are older. Let us try to carry them always where they will reflect the things that are beautiful and true. For the things they once reflect they go on reflecting to the last.

2. But when we are thinking about our own mirrors we must remember that other people are carrying mirrors too, and as we cannot help receiving reflexions in our mirrors, so we cannot help casting reflexions in theirs. We cannot help influencing other people any more than they can help influencing us. Your younger brothers and sisters, your companions at school, even your fathers and mothers are carrying your reflexions every day. Do you know the sad story of the small boy who lost the naughty word. Here it is as told by himself:

I lost a very little word
  Only the other day;
A very naughty little word
  I had not meant to say.
If only it were really lost,
  I should not mind a bit;
I think I should deserve a prize
  For really losing it.

But then it wasn't really lost
  When from my lips it flew;
My little brother picked it up,
  And now he says it too.
Mamma said that the worst would be
  I could not get it back;
But the worst of it now seems to me
  I'm always on its track.

Mamma is sad; papa looks grieved;
  Johnnie has said it twice:
Of course it is no use for me
  To tell him it's not nice.
When you lose other things, they're lost:
  But lose a naughty word,
And for every time 'twas heard before
  Now twenty times 'tis heard.

[1] M. E. Sangster.

If it were only really lost,
Oh, then I should be glad;
I let it fall so carelessly
The day that I got mad.
Lose other things, you never seem
To come upon their track;
But lose a naughty little word,
It's always coming back.

Whether we like it or not other people pick up our words and our ways and copy them. What kind of reflexion are you casting?

3. Most boys and girls have heard of radium and some of them may have seen it. Radium is a marvellous element that has been discovered within very recent years. It produces heat and light, and its rays of light are so strong that they can penetrate quite easily through steel or other metals. One of the most wonderful things about the light of radium is that it is reflective. If you shut up a small quantity of radium in a card-board box for a short time and then take it out, the box will continue to give forth rays of radium for some weeks.

Now there is one place we must not forget to take our mirrors, and that is into the presence of Jesus the Light of the World. If we take them to Him, He will shine upon them with a perfect radiance. Then we shall reflect that light, and help to bring brightness and gladness into the world.

How to be Sorry.

'Rend your heart, and not your garments.'—Joel 2^{13}.

'Rend your heart, and not your garments.' That sounds strange advice! Some of you know plenty about rending your garments, and I expect mother knows more than plenty about mending them. But that doesn't explain the text. What did the prophet Joel mean when he advised people to tear their hearts, and not their clothes?

Well, in the East they have lots of customs which we think strange, just as in the West we have lots of customs which an Eastern would consider strange. One of these ancient customs was to tear or rend the clothes to show grief, horror, or dismay. It must have been rather an expensive way of showing grief, you think. Yes, it does sound rather wasteful to our ears, but then we look at things with different eyes, and to the Jews it was a way of proving how deeply they were moved.

Then, if it was a usual custom to show grief in this way, why did the prophet tell the people to rend their heart instead of their garments? And what did he mean by 'rending their hearts'? To understand we must go back a little.

The people of Judah to whom the prophet spoke had been going through a terrible experience. They had been visited by a plague of locusts, and the corn and the vines and the fruit-trees had been eaten bare, so that there was left no food for either man or beast. To add to the horror of it all a drought had accompanied the plague, and the rivers had dried up and the ground had become burnt like a brick. It was very terrible: but Joel told the people of Judah that they deserved it all. God had sent the plague and the drought to punish them for their sins. And Joel pleaded with them to repent of these sins—not merely outwardly, by rending their garments as a sign of grief, but inwardly, by being sorry in their hearts. He urged them to turn to God with penitent hearts, and God, he said, would pardon their sins, and perhaps remove the plague.

It seems to me that often when we say we are sorry we are merely rending our garments instead of our hearts. We are sorry to all outward appearance, but we don't care a bit at heart. We say, 'Oh, sorry!' in an off-hand sort of way, and we are really anything but sorry.

Once I knew a little girl whose elder sister had snatched away from her her favourite doll. She was a fond mother, and she didn't stop to argue the matter. She hit her sister a hard blow, and nurse caught her doing it. Nurse didn't ask who was to blame, she vigorously shook the doll's mother, set her in the corner with her face to the wall, and told her to stay there till she was sorry. Half an hour passed and nurse asked if she were sorry now. 'No!' was the decided reply, 'I'm not.' At the end of another half-hour nurse repeated the question, and still dolly's mama said, 'No.' 'Ah, well!' said nurse, 'if you won't apologize, and say you are sorry, you must just remain where you are.' 'Oh!' said the mite, 'I'll say *I'pologize*, if you like, but I won't say *I'm sorry*, for I'm still glad I did it.'

That little woman was perfectly sincere and truthful. She knew the difference between *saying she was sorry*, and *feeling sorry*, and she would not

tell a lie even to get out of an uncomfortable corner. She wouldn't pretend what she didn't feel.

I'm afraid many people are content with pretending. But I don't want you to be one of those. I want you to be sorry with your heart as well as with your tongue. Being sorry with the tongue is only 'rending the garment,' but being sorry with the heart is 'rending the heart.'

Now I think you'll find that what we mostly have to be sorry for is one of two things: either saying or doing something to wound another, or persisting in some bad habit or fault.

1. *We have to be sorry for hurting some one.* How are we to be heart sorry for that? We are heart sorry when we not only apologize for the wrong but try to make up for it in some way, try to pay back in kindness an unkindness. Grown-up people call this 'reparation,' and it is a good name, for it means repairing as far as possible the damage you have done. And don't be content with a little reparation. Try how big a one you can make.

2. *We have to be heart sorry for our bad habits*, such as laziness or untruthfulness or selfishness or hot temper—any fault, in fact, that we know is wrong and yet persist in. And how are we to be sorry for a bad habit? Why, by stopping it! It's no use feeling a pang of sorrow at the moment and saying, 'I'll not do it again,' and then doing it the very next opportunity.

A gentleman once asked in a Sunday School in America what was meant by the word 'repentance.' A little boy raised his hand, 'Please, sir, being sorry for your sins.' A little girl also raised her hand. 'Well,' said the gentleman turning to her, 'what do you say?' 'Please, sir, it's being sorry enough to quit.'

Yes, that's it! Repentance is being sorry enough to quit, to stop doing the wrong, and to try with all your might and main never to do it again.

I won't promise you that it will be easy. In fact, I can tell you that it will often be extremely difficult. But then the difficult things in life are the things best worth doing. And I'll tell you this for your encouragement—the oftener you succeed, the easier you'll find it. So brace yourself, and go ahead.

The Christian Year.

Quinquagesima.

Emotion.

'They lifted up their voice and wept again, and Orpah kissed her mother-in-law, but Ruth clave unto her.'—Ruth 1^{14}.

There is a contrast between these girls. Both of them wept, for they had come to an end, and the chapter which was closing had brought marriage to them, and love, and hope, and bitter loss. Orpah kissed Naomi, for a girl likes to be kind, and the older woman had been a friend; yet having kissed her, she turned her face towards Moab.

If we widen out the question beyond the single case, we may recognize in the story two types of religion, of which only one has any value. Confessedly others than Orpah remain outside, mere Moabites to the end, whilst Ruth and hosts of companions with exactly the same amount of native disability are found within—and gloriously within. What accounts for so sharp a contrast? Both women were moved, but Orpah had nothing else than emotion, which expended itself in tears and embraces, whilst in Ruth the emotion had energy enough to carry her life and will along with it. Jesus warns us that 'not every one who saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven': like Orpah, it may be with a tearful face they turn away, and yet they remain outside. And what excludes them is not some churlishness or narrowness in God, it is the lack of serious purpose in themselves; for a will and hunger after God will open any door, it will master any exclusion.

The difference may become clearer as we study these types.

1. There is a kind of *religion which, practically, is without emotion.* Of this we have no example in the story, though in the world it is exceedingly common. Those who content themselves with it are often sober and diligent men, loyal to their word and faithful to their wives, and not forgetful of their Church. But in their religion there is no uplifting power; it is of the earth, and is fitted for inhabitants of this world. But the kingdom of God, as Jesus preached it, is more than a kingdom of virtuous earth; in its beginnings, it was the creation of His love and passion, and it was offered

to men, without condition, as to immortal creatures who have the larger part of their existence beyond the confines of this world. If we are to be citizens of it, we must have wings to lift us, that we may look down on life as He did, viewing its concerns *sub specie aeternitatis*, as they appear from the standpoint of eternity. Matthew Arnold defined religion as 'morality touched with emotion,' thus acknowledging that an element of this sort is indispensable; but the morality is not only touched with emotion, it is coloured and made glorious by it. And if in any man religion attains its end, that must be because it is inhabited by love and wonder, and the desire of things above.

2. There is *a religion which is mere emotion.* This is Orpah's type, in which what is lacking is will and persistence. Many people do not realize the shallowness of their own feeling. They 'pay themselves with words,' as the French say, finding a becoming phrase so satisfying that they ask for nothing more. In a sense, we all know that words are no sufficient indication of feeling. Goneril and Regan, King Lear's heartless daughters, were profuse in their professions of devotion, whilst Cordelia, who was willing to give her life for her father, was utterly awkward and stinted in speech:

I cannot heave
My heart into my mouth: I love your majesty
According to my bond, nor more nor less.

We do not need Shakespeare to tell us this; and yet in religion, and even in social life, we continue to delude ourselves, accepting the passing sentiment or the fit expression of it as if it were a full discharge of every debt. Jesus warns men that it is possible to come to the end of life with that delusion still unbroken: 'Have we not preached in Thy name, and in Thy name cast out devils, and in Thy name done many wonderful works?' And the claim is not disputed, for emotion, while it lasts, may carry people far: yet the answer is given from the Throne, 'I never knew you,' and thus they are outsiders still. What is most pitiful is that a man may, by his emotion, awaken a lasting interest in others and yet lose it in himself. 'The match which kindled the fire in the morning lies half consumed on the ribs in the afternoon': the fire of faith and love burns on in other hearts, when in the man himself it has died out. Having preached to others, he becomes a castaway.

Richard Steele, the essayist, wrote one morning to his wife after a racketing night, 'Dear Prue, sober or not I am ever yours, R. S.,' and there is no doubt that, for the moment, he meant what he said. But the fact was that, sober or not, he was not ever hers. He might return to her, but it required no very commanding interest to catch his mind away elsewhere, whilst poor Prue had to wait suspicious and indignant at home. A great deal of religion is of this quality, fugitive and volatile: 'O Ephraim, what shall I do unto thee?' cries God, 'for thy goodness is like the morning mist which quickly disappears'; and we cannot wonder that it should remain without effect.

3. But there is also *a religion compact of emotion and purpose.* This is Ruth's type, and to it all barriers are withdrawn, and the outcast passes in unchallenged to take her place with the family of God. Ruth can have known little of what lay in front of her. If she spoke Hebrew, it was no doubt stumblingly and with an accent; and in all the peculiarities of Hebrew life and usage which parted Bethlehem from Moab she would blunder often and have to make appeal for patience. Most of all, in religion and its practices she was barely at the threshold, only she had a mind that took her past the threshold and prepared her for anything that might be involved in being Hebrew now and not Moabite. And that steady casting of her vote on the nobler side secured her entrance, and, in God's mercy, it secures an entrance still.

To those who are halting at the door, well inclined to Christ's way, and yet undecided, and to those within the door whose task it should be to welcome and encourage, there is admonition even in the minor detail of the story. It is fine to see how promptly Ruth was taken at her word, and not held in some middle stage of probation. In Israel the name of Moabite was a grave burden of disadvantage, and odious tales were told of the origin of the tribes which sprang from Lot. But nothing of this suspicion and dislike appears in the talk of the village gossips. 'All the town knoweth that thou art a virtuous woman' (iii. 11) was their report of her, and to Naomi they said (iv. 15), 'Thy daughter-in-law, which loveth thee, is better to thee than seven sons.' It is very pretty. In that jealously exclusive people she was not kept at arm's length; and in their tradition she sits enthroned, though she was born an outcast beyond recovery. She is a mother in Israel, mother of David, mother of Jesus the Christ, so gloriously has she entered within the pale, because with heart and will she sought for it.[1]

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Repentance unto Life*, 196.

First Sunday in Lent.

Offences.

'Woe unto the world because of occasions of stumbling! for it must needs be that the occasions come; but woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh! And if thy hand or thy foot causeth thee to stumble, cut it off, and cast it from thee: it is good for thee to enter into life maimed or halt, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into the eternal fire. And if thine eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: it is good for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into the hell of fire.'—Mt 18^{7-9}.

The injunctions of our Saviour in regard to self-sacrifice are not difficult to understand if people approach them intelligently. Those who know Christ are confident that He did not advocate self-mutilation for its own sake or preach the impoverishment of life. If ever Christ asks men to deny themselves it is in order that more completely their true nature may be enlarged. If ever He bids men to 'cut off' or 'pluck out' a faculty, it is not for useless sacrifice, but in order that the main ends of life may be secured. It is manifest that three dangers of the soul to which our Lord made reference in this passage of St. Matthew's Gospel are inimical to the main ends of life.

1. 'The offence of the hand' to which our Lord drew attention may be described in less pictorial phrase as *over-practicalness*. It can hardly be questioned that the finer elements of human nature are constantly subject to harm from the excessive development of practical activity. Man's destiny is to labour, and the curse on Cain was probably a blessing. But man was made for something more than labour. If a merchant tells you that he has been so absorbed with business that the worry of it has been with him from morning to night, and he has had no time for reading or thoughtfulness, or even for the society of his family, and on Sundays he has been too tired to go to church, and has spent most of the day in bed, you can hardly help asking him, Is it worth while? Does it pay? Would you not be better to 'cut off' some of this activity and try to be your own man and, as the French say, 'make your soul'? If one meets a woman whose life is one long harassing anxiety over domestic cares and housekeeping and social duties, it is permissible to ask, Were you made for that? Surely intelligence was not given merely to be starved, and a woman's nature is too finely dowered if she was intended only to be a frivolous plaything or a domestic drudge. Powers of reason and imagination and feeling and insight and faith and hope and love seem wasted on the man or woman who is only a machine. A man has more to do than conduct his business. A woman has more to do than to look after her home and her children. They have minds to cultivate, affections to develop, character to train for heaven.

'You were always a good man of business,' said Scrooge to the Ghost in Dickens' *Christmas Books*. 'Business!' cried the Ghost, 'mankind was my business, the common welfare was my business; the dealings of my trade were but a drop of water in the comprehensive ocean of my business.' If a man does not learn that sooner, he learns it when he comes to die.

2. Our Lord proceeded to indicate another risk of the highest life. He called it 'the offence of the foot'—a hard ambition and the determination at all hazards to 'get on.' Of course the opposite extreme of sluggishness finds no countenance in our Lord's teaching: it is severely rebuked by the Parable of the Talents, in which the man who kept his one talent in a napkin was denounced as a 'wicked and slothful servant.' In one of Edmund Burke's earliest speeches he explained the motives that animated him in seeking to be elected to the House of Commons: 'I wish to be a member of Parliament and to have my share of doing good and resisting evil.' That was surely a noble ambition, and there is a glow of fire in Disraeli's appeal to an audience of young men at Manchester: 'Young men, I bid you to aspire.' Legitimate anxiety for advancement, especially when the motive is service rather than personal distinction, is nowhere discouraged by the Word of God. 'If a man desire the office of a bishop,' said St. Paul, 'he desireth a good work.' Such forecasts of the future in hope and emulation are the spring of youthful enterprise. The dream of 'getting on' is an innocent and stimulating dream. But there can be no worse enemy of the finer qualities of the nature than a fierce and self-regarding ambition. The man whose every action is prompted by a far-sighted vision of his own advantage or promotion: the woman to whom social position and the acquaintance of people of rank and fashion are more important than old friendships or simple kindly offices of affection—they are bartering the best of life for an unholy worship of success. The climbers, the jostlers, the greedy claimants of place and honour, are among the most contemptible of

mankind. It is they to whom our Lord referred when He spoke of the offence of the foot. 'Cut it off,' was His sharp, swift remedy.

If ambition is hardening your heart, get rid of the ambition. 'By that sin,' said Cardinal Wolsey, 'fell the angels; how can man, then, the image of his Maker, hope to win by it?' Courtesy loses all its charm if it is suspected that a man is only courteous because he is afraid of making an enemy or losing a possible helper in his upward career. Sympathy and kindness are discounted if a sinister motive of prospective gain is discovered behind them. All the sweet wells of life are poisoned by undue ambition. The truth is that no honour worth having is worth seeking. If distinction and the regard of our fellows and the outward rewards of diligent public service do not come to a man as a spontaneous tribute of his fellow-citizens or fellow-Churchmen to disinterested merit, they lose whatever value they might contain.

3. The third sin of which our Lord spoke might be given the colloquial name of *Knowingness*. It is the offence of the man whose eyes are so sharp that he detects the flaws in every honourable character and the unworthy motives below every virtuous act. 'I am nothing,' said Iago, one of the most villainous characters in all literature, 'if I am not critical.' 'Every man has his price,' said the English politician, Walpole. 'Every woman is at heart a rake,' said Byron. That is the judgment on human nature which the very clever observers make. It is the offence of the eye. 'Once, when I was young,' such a man would tell you, 'I was simple and gullible. I believed in disinterested friendship and a pure passion of love. I was credulous enough to fancy that people might like me for myself, and might serve me without dreaming of a return. I know better now. David said in his haste that "all men are liars." I am ready to repeat it at my leisure.' Such is the unholy verdict of the man with the sharp eyes. In his judgment there is an unworthy motive under every apparently generous deed: mere prejudice under patriotism; vanity under benevolence; a selfish pride of possession under a woman's virtue; the hope of heaven even under a pretended love to God. It is just about the worst sign of any man that he should come to think and speak like that. Indeed, it is the devil's sin. For what does the word 'devil,' 'diabolus,' mean but the accuser—the slanderer of God and man?

It is recorded of our Lord Jesus that 'He knew what was in man.' Man's true nature was visible to Him. But there were no words of scorn on those tender lips; no 'fierce indignation' tore His heart as it tore the gloomy heart of the satirist Swift. The eye was gentle with which the Lord Jesus looked on the men and women of His day. He knew how much of divine potentiality lay behind those imperfect lives. And let a sorrow come to us, and we too are amazed to discover how kind people can be, how warm are hearts that we had fancied frigid and self-contained. Let us really need friendship at a pinch, and all that is best in the people we know leaps up to the requirement. Is a kindly judgement or the scorn of the satirist the truer estimate of human worth? If thine eye, O clever man of the world, be thus offending thee—if you who boast about having seen life (though it is really death you have seen) have no longer a generous estimate of your fellows and no longer a belief in friendship or love—bethink you that you are mistaken. You are not ungenerous only, you are unjust. Pluck out that eye of knowingness—that clever, cynical, devilish spirit of mistrust. Learn to be like your Lord again, the Lord of love; and pray for the spirit of a little child.[1]

Second Sunday in Lent.

Ashes.

'To give unto them beauty for ashes.'—Is 61^3.

In the Gospel according to Isaiah, there are many metaphors of striking beauty and prophetic tenderness; among them there is not one more arresting and appealing than the lovely little sentence which forms the text. It opens up a symbolism as rich as it is tender, full of instruction, and leading to the very heart of the Eternal. If we find the meaning of the words, we shall get close to the sheltering wounds of the Son of God, and feel the throb of the Infinite love.

In the Old Testament ashes represent four things.

1. First, and perhaps most of all, they are the symbol of human frailty. You remember the sentence which Abraham used in speaking to God, 'I am but dust and ashes.' In those words he spoke for the race. There is a frailty from which there is no escape, and of which there is no conquering. In the service by the grave, in the words of committal there is the phrase, 'ashes to ashes.' It is fitly used as a confession of weakness. Man's greatness at times seems to march to the very heavens; he rises as on eagle wings into the white light of the throne; yet his frailty makes him akin to the ashes and the dust. His thought soars upwards and onwards: it knows no bounds. It explores the unknown, yet by his frailty he is bound as by a chain. So many links of liberty—and then no more. Our frailty holds us at every point; while we know something of greatness and glory,

[1] R. H. Fisher, *The Outside of the Inside*.

we are conscious of the ashes—the final symbol of life, ashes blown by the winds into little heaps to be scattered again. We sometimes think we are strong as the gods, but a sudden twinge of pain tells the story of our frailty.

2. The symbol stands for humiliation. Mordecai, in the Book of Esther, is represented sitting in the gate, humbled, brought down to the dust. When he approached the Queen he went in ashes, and Esther took upon herself the symbols of humiliation. Jonah speaks to the disappointed monarch, sitting amid the ashes. We read of the kings who placed ashes upon their heads to depict that they had been brought low. Humiliation is not now indicated by the same symbols. We do not publish our defeat as men used to do, but it is none the less real. No man thinks deeply without frequently being humbled, and made to realize the humiliation of his limitations. We see so far, and beyond there is the mist, through which no eye can carry us. The feeling that throbs in one's heart craves expression. The little child on mother's bosom seeks in some way to acknowledge the caress that is so soft and sweet, but the little one has no language except a croon or a crow that is without intelligence. Mother's heart may interpret it, but it has no place in the dictionary. Our speech at its best is an attempt to express the inexpressible. We do not get beyond the crooning and crowing. When all has been said, we are conscious that we have not quite expressed what we felt. You never said your best things; you never will; and the consciousness of failure is humiliation.

3. The ashes symbolized in the Old Testament grief. Job, when he could not cry any more, sat down amid the ashes. It told the tale of his sorrow that was too great for words. The women who had lost everything sprinkled ashes on the threshold of the home. They told of the desolation and the emptiness within. The home had become a prison; the presence which was the light of love had gone; the music had died away in silence. Death had swallowed up life, and the ashes interpreted the grief.

Anne Brontë tells the story of a broken heart in some lines of a hymn. Anne was the sister who tried to keep a smiling face, though the pain was always in her limbs. She brought gladness to the heart of her clever sister Charlotte. While her limbs were so contracted, and hands so deformed that she could scarcely hold a pen, she wrote those words:

I hoped that with the brave and strong,
My portioned task might lie:
To toil amid the busy throng,
With purpose pure and high:
But God has fixed another part,
And He has fixed it well;
I said so with my breaking heart,
When first this trouble fell.

They ought not to be sung. They are the agonized cry of the soul, the symbol of grief.[1]

Third Sunday in Lent.

Beauty.

'Beauty for ashes.'—Is 61^3.

In the Revised Version of the Scriptures, the word 'beauty' gives place to the word 'garland.' George Adam Smith translates it by the term 'crown.' They are all near the truth, but do not quite express it. It has beauty as a garland of flowers, and the garland represents the crown or, better, the flowers about the head of the one in authority. In 1 Ch 20^2, there is the story of David coming back with a garland upon his head, with the crown, the beauty that marked him as the victor, as the man of power in battle. He was acclaimed the one in authority. Power was in his hands; he wore the garland; upon him rested the beauty. Paul speaks of the believers who were his joy, his crown—the garland representative of gladness. In the Roman feasts every guest wore a twist of flowers about the head. When Caesar called the guests to his table, the first thing was to place a garland upon each as the sign of joy and festivity. God gives a garland of gladness. He makes our hearts joyful by His presence. The normal note of the Christian life is joy. It is just as much a command to 'Rejoice in the Lord' as 'Thou shalt not steal.' Beauty stands for reward. In 1 Cor 9^{24}, St. Paul speaks of those who run to obtain the crown. He speaks of the incorruptible crown that is laid up for those who follow the Christ and are faithful. In the Book of Revelation there is frequent use of the crown as the symbol of final victory. Let us see a message in the metaphor.

1. We are all conscious of our weakness. This is the glad tidings, that God gives power to the frail. There is weakness that is the prophecy of strength, a frailty that is the indication of a greater power than that born of our common nature. God

[1] J. C. Carlile, *Vision and Vocation*, 174.

is might, and worketh in us mightily to accomplish His will. It is 'not by might or by power, but by my Spirit,' saith the Lord. There comes a time when all our human force can avail nothing, and we turn not to knock or seek, but to ask, and we receive. They that wait upon the Lord shall change their strength. Their strength that was weakness is laid aside, and they receive strength that does not fail. When one realizes the meaning of dust and ashes, one is very near to the Divine secret. The world is greatly indebted to people who were physically weak. One of the paradoxes of life is that so frequently strength is derived from a broken reed—that the strong guiding intellect is in a body so frail that it is hardly capable of effort. The treasure of God is often in earthen vessels, sometimes in broken vessels. There was one who said: 'When I am weak, then I am strong'; he knew the Divine secret.

2. It is a great thing to know the secret place where God gives beauty for ashes. It is hard by the Cross, where love is revealed in suffering. Do not hesitate to bring all your grief to Him. I think He loves to lift the heavy load. It is a great saying of St. Augustine that 'God is happiness; not simply true, but Truth; not only beautiful, but Beauty—and in Him, from Him, and through Him all things are happy and true and lovely which are so at all.' As we enter into communion with the Divine Lord, joy fills the soul, and the outstanding characteristic of the faithful is their deep abounding joy.

I have found a joy in sorrow
A secret balm for pain—

is the experience of those who sincerely seek the upward way. Following Christ is not simply a series of renunciations. It is delight in the practice of His presence. We need not pity the early saints in their trials, terrible as they were. They went through the world with a song in their heart. They had received the Master's gift of joy. As we read their story, its strange note, so unlike the familiar representations of the saints, there is an answering echo in our hearts like the waking of a long-forgotten melody: 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.' There is the treasure of His grace waiting for us: beauty for ashes.

In Canterbury Cathedral there is Beckett's tomb, over which there used to be a shrine to which many pilgrims went. The shrine was approached by a flight of steps. The religious came up upon their knees, following an ancient custom. It sometimes happened that among the pilgrims would be some who walked up the steps, and came boldly to the shrine, but they did not receive the benediction. The old priests were very careful only to give the blessing to those who were upon their knees. The custom may have been nothing more than the growth of a superstition, but it points a moral. The blessing is for the lowly. It will come to us while we are upon our knees. Perhaps God does not use some gifted men because they are not lowly enough. Not many great, not many wise, have been called to the higher stations of service. He delights to take the base things of the earth to confound the mighty, to lift up the lowly, and to give honour to the humble.

3. If it be true that there is no rose without its thorn, it is equally true that there is no thorn without its rose. In grief the sweetest joys are born. The promise does not mean that God will take away the grief and give joy in place of it, but rather that in the very heart of the grief itself there is a joy infinitely greater than sorrow; that in the cup of bitterness there is something else that changes its nature. 'It is better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all.' It is better that the heart should be broken than that it should remain simply a piece of flesh like the heart of an ox; the very wound may be the opening of the fountain of a purer joy and a truer life than was known. Whatever temple success may build, there will always need to be hard by a little Gothic chapel for sorrowing souls.

On the human side, all life ends in defeat. The strongest must come to the dust and ashes at last. No poetry can make the grave other than the grave. It is the place where the defeated are laid out of sight. Life begins with frailty and ends in defeat. If we be not more than human we are less than we suppose. Life goes out in darkness, and the strongest is broken as the surf upon the sea. But thank God it is true that in the place of defeat we may find victory. There is beauty for ashes. Where we see failure, we shall behold success; where we see oblivion, God rings up the curtain. It is not the end, but the opening of another chapter. What in this life is called death, in the life beyond is known as birth; and when we behold it from the other side, we shall not say, 'So-and-so has died,' but 'has been born into life.' That is the message of the metaphor.[1]

[1] J. C. Carlile, *Vision and Vocation.*

On Accepting Christ.

By the Reverend John A. Hutton, D.D., Glasgow.

The whole idea of accepting Christ rests upon an earlier idea, and that earlier idea may be expressed in some such way as this: Life reduces us all one by one to a position in which, if we are sincere with ourselves, we confess we have failed. It may be that we have erred or transgressed, and the fruits of our transgression have come back upon us overwhelmingly. Or it may be that, face to face with life, we have suddenly become aware of a certain moral weariness which makes the very prospect of days and years tiresome and intolerable. Or it may be that we have found ourselves out in some sinister and treacherous aptitude which honestly makes us afraid. Or it may be that in our thinking about life, about this whole human scene which at best is so ambiguous, so capable of diverse and contrary interpretations, with its mornings and its evenings, with its joys and its sorrows, with its headlong hours and its bitter reactions, with its love and its loss, with its life and its death,—it may be, I say, that the whole aspect of things puzzles and frustrates our will. But, however this sense of defeat and failure, of having been brought to a standstill, may come to us one by one, the New Testament doctrine of accepting Christ seems to myself to rest upon the idea that this sense of failure and defeat has indeed come, and that out of it, in a kind of struggle for our life, for our self-respect, for our sanity, we are now ready without reservation to let Christ help us.

I hold that this is not only a true statement of the New Testament relation between Christ and the human soul; it is also a sound and incontrovertible fact. One comes to Christ never, no matter how early, with a clean sheet, but always with a soul bearing within itself traces, reminiscences, of a moral career. And, at least so it seems to me, and such is my own experience, one comes to Christ with passion and utterly, when in some matter one suddenly perceives that something vital is about to be lost.

I hold that this certainly is the catholic experience of accepting Christ. Recall the great psalms which are fragments of human biography at some unusually acute passage. Recall the crises in the souls of the great saints, and I think you will always find that something had become no longer tolerable, and out of this intolerable sense the human soul, in weakness and fear and passion, committed itself to some one who could save it.

I know that this is far removed from the attitude which many good and serious people take in our own day. These rather suggest that the spiritual life should begin with a kind of admiration of Jesus, with an acquaintance with what He said and what He did, and how He moved amongst men; whereupon, it is assumed, there will be something about Him, some charm, some appeal to our sensibility, which will draw out our heart towards Him, that we shall be touched by the pathos and dignity of His life, and shall feel ashamed that human beings who share our nature should have compassed His brutal death; and that all this will soften men's hearts and reveal to them a way of meeting their own life and bearing themselves in their own hard hours and in facing in the end of the days their own abrupt passage from this sun-lit world.

Well, these are not days for good people to exaggerate their differences. God prosper every man who loves the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth! All that I am saying is that in the New Testament and in history the first love of Jesus was a theological love of Christ. Those who loved Him and who first died for Him loved Him and died for Him not because of what we moderns call His charm (is there not a verse which the Early Church made much of from Isaiah, 'There is no beauty that we should desire him'?), but because they had come to perceive and, in the case of others, to believe, that in this Jesus was the long answer of God to that cry for relief, for deliverance, for security, which had broken from the great souls of their people in all generations.

And so our fathers made use of a formula which is by no means dead among us, a formula indeed which will never die, for apprehended with sympathy it is seen to embody a bit of imperishable truth; our fathers made use of the formula that there preceded conversion a state of conscience which they called 'conviction of sin.'

For myself, I think that they erred in making *that* the only strait gate and narrow way into the New Jerusalem. They erred perhaps in closing up other gates into the heavenly city each of which is a pearl,—something, that is to say, compounded of a wound and the agony of a wound and the resources in God for the healing of that agony. But they were not wrong in saying that, before one would give himself to Christ with passion and abandonment and great joy, there always was the conviction that there was no other course. They were wrong, I say, in barricading other gates against pilgrims; because it is not a man's sense of sin only that can bring him to a standstill in this world: but they were not wrong in saying that for every pilgrim the way led on to a narrow place, so narrow that a man standing there is quite alone with God.

This would all seem to mean that in the case of each of us there may be portions of our life long or short in which we are not aware of any discord or uneasiness or fear such as might urge us to seek relief of mind somewhere. And I think that the New Testament admits that there are such flat intervals when the eyes of our soul are closed. But the New Testament is equally sure that times come in every life when, for any one of many reasons, our heart and flesh cry out in some pain or uneasiness or actual fear. Then it is, the New Testament declares, a man must be loyal to himself, must be faithful to the uneasiness of his spirit, must set out in company with that uneasiness towards whatever promises him relief and light; and if such a man has heard of God, of Christ, if he has ever heard that we men are not alone in the world, he must not allow that urgent hour to pass.

'I am the vine; ye are the branches,' said Jesus; and I am sure our Lord intended us to ponder His words, words which were spoken with great gravity and deliberateness. As a branch is grafted into the vine not by bringing it loosely bark to bark, or even binding it with cords; as a branch is grafted on a vine by cutting the branch until it bleeds, and cutting the vine until it bleeds, and as then you press the bleeding branch into the bleeding tree, making them one in a common agony,—so a human life which becomes one with Christ in the New Testament sense, and one for ever, becomes one by an act of faith which is almost an act of desperation, clutching at Christ by the force of some elementary necessity.

There are two matters which compel us all to deal deeply with ourselves, matters which, unless we accept Christ with regard to them, reduce us to a fear and sadness in which, until it is relieved, we are at a standstill. The one matter is the whole question of the forgiveness of our sins; and the other the whole question of the meaning of this life of ours.

With regard to the former, I know that there is much in the intellectual fashion of our time and in our personal habits which has obscured the reality of that question, and has seemed for the time being to have blunted the edge of conscience; but I refuse to believe that any such dullness and incompetence for moral pain is more than a fashion. Nay, I will maintain that no human soul has always been free of those moral misgivings which in the great souls have cried out.

In order to bring the necessity for forgiveness home to us all with freshness, it may be necessary for us in these days to state the matter somewhat differently. The question with which St. Paul wrestled was, 'How can a man be just before God?' How can God forgive, that is to say, annul and undo, what we men have done against His holy laws? How can God forgive a man who has sinned? And, starting there, St. Paul could end honourably only by accepting the testimony of Jesus that God in Christ had taken upon Himself the sin of man. But perhaps we might bring it all home to ourselves more poignantly were we to put the same matter in another way; for example, in this way: 'How am I to forgive myself? How can I recover my self-respect? How can I deal with the accusations of my own mind?' This is the problem which struggles towards a solution in all the great work of the human soul in literature. It is the problem with which the Greek writers of tragedy wrestled. It is the problem of *Pilgrim's Progress*, and of *The Scarlet Letter*; and, in our day, of all the great literature of Russia. These more modern men can find only this solution: If I have sinned, I have sinned against some one. That some one has borne the stroke or weight of my selfish deed, and, now that I see the shame of my act, there is nothing left for me, until the day I die, but to try to make amends to that one or to those whom I have wronged. I

must hope for no heaven for myself which they cannot share. If any man hath aught against me, as our Lord put it, I must go and seek him and take him by the hand and share with him till the day I die every blessing life offers me.

But even that, when one looks deeply into it, is no solution, though that indeed is part of the Christian obligation. No: when all is said and done, with regard to those things that are past for which our conscience blames us, we must simply accept Christ. And the only way in which we can get back our sense of self-respect is, if you will, to make a kind of compact with Christ, and say, 'Well, Lord, if I accept from Thee this forgiveness, it can only be on this condition, that henceforward Thou hast the absolute right to control and to order and to possess my life. I am no longer my own; I am Thine, for Thy forgiveness' sake.'

The other matter on which life brings us to a standstill is as to the whole meaning of this world and our part in it. Here also, in the last push of the inquiry, I reach a point where I must accept Christ or reject Him. I may be in doubt as to what I ought to make of life; but Christ was in no doubt as to what He ought to make of life. I may be in doubt as to what it all means; but He was in no doubt as to what it all means. And what makes me a Christian is that I accept Christ: I take Christ's way.

When I say I accept Christ, I think I am beginning more and more to mean that I accept Christ's report and testimony both as to the human soul, its true nature, and as to God, His nature and purpose. When I say to-day I believe in Christ, I do not simply mean I believe that Christ lived; and at the moment I am not meaning that I assent to all the dogmatic propositions about Christ which the Church in her radiant days announced. When I say I believe in Christ, I want to be understood as meaning I believe in all that Christ stood for; I believe in that whole background and context of His Spirit as the sure and only reality. I do not mean by that to say that I see it all clearly; I rather mean that I am going to try to see it clearly. For is this not what we mean when we say we believe in anything? We do not mean that we see the thing which we believe. We do not mean even that the evidence for it is overwhelming. We mean rather that we are going to believe in it, that we are going to act as though it were incontrovertible to us.

The fact is I am coming more and more to think of my faith as my personal vote which all alone and in the Presence of God I register. Life is a matter on which we must all put down our name on the side of Christ or elsewhere on the paper. A man cannot escape a decision about life; and those who try to keep away from the voting-place are counted very properly as on the other side. Not to vote for Christ is to vote against Him.

I recall an experience, as once upon a time I was returning from New York to Liverpool. We sat one afternoon on board ship, four of us, talking. The other three were Americans, a husband and wife and another man. The conversation began somewhat casually, about American affairs, and was confined to those two American citizens. It took something like this direction: 'Well,' said a man from San Francisco, 'President Roosevelt is making a mess of things, isn't he?' to which the other, a friend of my own from New York, replied, almost casually also, 'I don't see that.' 'Why, are not your securities down five points already?' 'Oh yes,' replied the other, 'I believe some of my securities are down ten points.' 'Well!' said the one. 'Well!' said the other; and added, 'I think that a very small price to pay for the salvation of the country.' 'Oh, I don't go in for that way of talking,' said the first speaker, 'I think if we have the power in our hands we ought to use it for all its worth.' (I should have said that they were both very rich men.) 'But there you run right up against Christ.' 'Oh, I don't think the name of Christ should be brought into this proposition.' 'But I think the Name of Christ should be brought into all the propositions.' And, my friend continued, sitting now well forward in his seat, and speaking with an extraordinary seriousness, with sadness one might say: 'Look here, my young friend,' he said, 'I am an older man than you. I don't mean that I am a better man at all; but, as I have said, I think the Name of Christ should be brought into all the propositions. Men talk to-day as though we were here to do what we like. Now, as I figure it, we are here to do what is right. It's often mighty hard, and it's just there Christ helps me. He helps me to see what's right, and He makes trying to do it seem worth while!'

There was a silence for a few minutes, and afterwards, not unfriendlily, the other two left us. I turned to my friend, and—naming him—said, 'It did me good to hear you say these things. I felt I could not say them. Had I said them, wearing this collar and these clothes, he might have said afterwards, "Oh, that is so much professional talk; that is his job"; but you saying them—it was all wonderful.' To which, putting his hand deprecatingly upon my knee, and looking as it seemed to me across the waters, he said with a tone of conviction touched with something that sounded like sadness, but was not sadness, only a firmness and resoluteness of the soul, 'Well, Doctor, I'm in for Christianity!' It was as though he had said, 'The thing may be wrong. I don't know. But it is right for me. It is the thing that I would like to think is right. That is the kind of world I'd like to feel this world to be. That is the kind of world I'd like to help to make it. I'm in for Christianity!'

That is what an honest man means to-day who accepts Christ. He is in for Christianity; that is to say, he is out for it.

Entre Nous.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

Action.

1. A minister of the parish of Kinneff, in Kincardineshire, was anxious that his son should succeed him. The parishioners had the right of election, and the schoolmaster was induced to do a little canvassing. One farmer refused to vote for the son. 'What for no?' said the schoolmaster. 'Because he cannot preach.' 'He cannot preach? *He keeps a good sough going.* What more do you want?'

The farmer wanted more, and so did the majority of the parishioners. But the schoolmaster had a good argument. For did not Demosthenes mean something of that kind when he said that the first thing in oratory was *action*, the second thing *action*, and the third thing *action*?

We owe the anecdote to the *Lives of the Ten Orators*, which is ascribed to Plutarch. It is not to be found in the authentic *Life of Demosthenes*, by Plutarch, but the narrative there is worth quoting:

'Another time, when the assembly had refused to hear him, and he was going home with his head muffled up, taking it very heavily, they relate that Satyrus, the actor, followed him, and being his familiar acquaintance, entered into conversation with him. To whom, when Demosthenes bemoaned himself, that having been the most industrious of all the pleaders, and having almost spent the whole strength and vigour of his body in that employment, he could not yet find any acceptance with the people, that drunken sots, mariners, and illiterate fellows were heard, and had the hustings for their own, while he himself was despised. 'You say true, Demosthenes,' replied Satyrus, 'but I will quickly remedy the cause of all this, if you will repeat to me some passage out of Euripides or Sophocles.' Which, when Demosthenes had pronounced, Satyrus presently taking it up after him, gave the same passage, in his rendering of it, such a new form, by accompanying it with the proper mien and gesture, that to Demosthenes it seemed quite another thing. By this being convinced how much grace and ornament language acquires from action, he began to esteem it a small matter, and as good as nothing for a man to exercise himself in declining, if he neglected enunciation and delivery. Hereupon he built himself a place to study underground (which was still remaining in our time), and hither he would come constantly every day to form his action, and to exercise his voice; and here he would continue, oftentimes without intermission, two or three months together, shaving one-half of his head, that so for shame he might not go abroad, though he desired it ever so much.'

From this comes the story in the *Lives of the Ten Orators* that when some one asked him, What is the first thing in oratory? he said, 'Action'; what the second? 'Action'; what the third? 'Action.'

What did he mean by Action?

(1) J. G. Holyoake thinks that by action Demosthenes meant *practice*. 'Action,' he says, 'gives no

power, and Dr. Clair J. Grece must be right when contending that the answer of the great orator should be translated: "Practice, practice, practice," for there skill comes in. A man who wishes to speak well at a moment's notice should speak every night if he has an opportunity. Preachers and barristers speak better at will than other persons.'

(2) The meaning most usually assigned to the word is *gesture*. This is how Bacon understood it. In the introduction to his essay *Of Boldness*, he says: 'It is a trivial grammar-school text, but yet worthy a wise man's consideration: A question was asked of Demosthenes, "What was the chief part of an orator?" he answered, "Action: What next? Action: What next again? Action." He said it that knew it best, and had by nature himself no advantage in that he commended. A strange thing, that that part of an orator which is but superficial, and rather the virtue of a player, should be placed so high above those other noble parts, of invention, elocution, and the rest; nay, almost alone, as if it were all in all. But the reason is plain. There is in human nature generally more of the fool than of the wise; and therefore those faculties by which the foolish part of men's minds is taken are most potent.'

(3) But Bacon was thinking of the Latin translation *actio*, from which our English word comes. The word used by Demosthenes was *hypocrisis*, that is, 'acting,' not action. The point is that Satyrus, the actor, threw himself into the spirit of the passage. He identified himself for the moment with the person speaking. 'The speaker,' says Boyd Carpenter, 'is for the moment the living voice of the truth with which he is imbued. Just as the true actor is the man who lives his part, completely identifying himself with the character he assumes, so the forcible speaker is the man whose whole personality is enlisted in the subject. This is the true *hypocrisis* which is not the assumption of a part, but the identification of self with it. The man makes it his own, as we say. His own personality is one with his subject. The words are there, but the man is there too. We hear him; and his very heart-beats sound in his voice. Hypocrisy assumes the appearance of things which it does not feel; this is the bad sense: Demosthenes used the word in the good sense. He meant that power of really feeling, living, and acting in the thoughts and words spoken, which I call the power of self-identification with one's work.[1]

(4) Now it is when the preacher thus identifies himself with his theme that the sermon has vitality and 'go' in it. 'It is the live coal,' says Julius Hare, 'that kindles others, not the dead. Nay, the same principle applies to all oratory; and what made Demosthenes the greatest of orators, was that he appeared the most entirely possesst by the feelings he wisht to inspire. The main use of his *hypocrisis* was, that it enabled him to remove the natural hindrances which checkt and clogged the stream of those feelings, and to pour them forth with a free and mighty torrent that swept his audience along. The effect produced by Charles Fox, who by the exaggerations of party-spirit was often compared to Demosthenes, seems to have arisen wholly from this earnestness, which made up for the want of almost every grace, both of manner and style.'[2]

Was it not something like this that the Kinneff schoolmaster meant when he claimed that the young preacher 'kept a good sough going'?

'A sermon is never too long if it be alive from start to finish, but if the hearers become listless, it is a sure sign that the sermon has lost its vitality. In such a situation the closure should be applied promptly.[3]

SOME TOPICS.

Discouragement.

'One of the rules for officers of the King's Navy reads: "No officer shall speak discouragingly to his mate, either on the watch or at mess, concerning the business on which he is or may be engaged." There is no other way of conducting the campaign of life.'[4]

A Magic Word.

'The East had its story of a magic word which had supernatural power. Whisper it before a barred door, and the door opened of its own accord! It is no mere story; it is the embodiment of an everlasting fact.

A simple ring with a single stone,
To the vulgar eye no stone of price:
Whisper the right word, that alone—
Forth starts a sprite, like fire from ice.

[1] W. Boyd Carpenter, *Lectures on Preaching*, 11.
[2] *Guesses at Truth*, 400.
[3] A. Benvie, *The Minister at Work*, 119.
[4] J. A. Hutton, *On Accepting Ourselves*, 39.

And lo, you are lord (says an Eastern scroll)
Of heaven and earth, lord whole and sole,
Through the power in a pearl.

'We are all strangers to one another, and at the depths it may be can never be anything but strangers; and yet let us utter the true word, the mystic word, the understanding word, the word which belongs to the mother-tongue of the race, the word which fell from heaven and created man—utter the right word, and the sun comes out and this world is no longer a harsh battlefield, but a place of dear human habitations.'[1]

ANNUALS FOR 1920.

Who's Who.

Who's Who for 1920 (A. & C. Black; 42s.) comes too late for extended notice this month. Yet it must be noticed, for its indispensability grows with its growth, and no one can do without it even for a month. First there is its readableness. For sheer interest it is as good as any—novel, we were about to say, but novels are down to the lowest depth of dulness—modern volume of sermons. Next there is its psychology. Why worry over manuals and text-books? Here are the materials for psychological study in rich variety and undeniable veracity. Then there is the information it contains. But that is the book and our space.

Hazell.

The New Hazell Annual and Almanack for 1920 (Henry Frowde and Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net) is probably the cheapest book this year will see published. Its 900 pages of double column and small type are packed with knowledge; and it is just such knowledge as every educated and half-educated person needs to know. As for its new features the editor says, and says truly, that in addition to the varied information which makes Hazell the most comprehensive and reliable book of reference published, there appear in the 1920 edition many interesting new articles—an exhaustive summary of the Peace Treaties with Germany, Austria, and Bulgaria, the full text of the Covenant of the League of Nations, Labour's Charter under the League of Nations. Attention may also be directed to the articles Socialism at Home and Abroad, the new Imperial Customs Tariff, with its preferential rates, and the exhaustive article on War Pensions and Allowances. Maps of the new Germany and the new Austria will also be found in their appropriate places.

[1] J. A. Hutton, *On Accepting Ourselves*, 102.

Church and University.

The Scottish Church and University Almanac (Edinburgh: Macniven & Wallace; 2s. 6d. net) is one of the most accurate of our annuals. It gives the information when the information is supplied; when it is not supplied it does not invent it. Thus none of the stipends are given for the Church of Scotland this year. The column is a blank, page after page.

The People's Year Book.

The People's Year Book (Co-operative Press Agency; 2s. net) is the annual of the Co-operative Societies. But it contains much matter of general interest in addition to all that it has to say to the co-operators. There is an article on Farming by Professor James Long, and one on the Coming Revolution in English Local Government by Mr. Sidney Webb.

Alexander Smellie.

In his book *The Outside of the Inside*, Dr. Fisher speaks of the Edinburgh University Debating Societies of his day, and says: 'By far the most brilliant man—the most original in mind and the weightiest in speech—was Alexander Smellie. He became and remains the minister of a small Original Secession Church. He bound himself by a vow to this service, and has nobly stood by his promised word. Otherwise, any career was open to him; he would have risen to distinction in any walk of life. Happily no promise prevented Smellie from contributing to literature. His book on *The Men of the Covenant* provides one of the most fascinating pictures that ever have been given of a romantic period of Scottish history.[2]

Courtesy.

Mrs. 'Robb' was the wife of a coachman at a house I knew well. At that time among women it was only fashionable ladies and cinder-pickers who smoked, and it would have been thought

[2] R. H. Fisher, *The Outside of the Inside*.

somewhat shameful for a respectable woman to indulge herself so. But Mrs. Robb was known to have a pipe. The young men of the house took delight in going to the stables to join her in the surreptitious pleasure. When Mrs. Robb's husband died, I went to condole with her, and this was the dear old woman's confession: 'Ye ken I'm fond of a draw. Tam didna like it. But when it cam' to nine o'clock he would say, "Janet, ye'll be wanting your smoke," and he would gang out.'[1]

NEW POETRY.

Francis Ledwidge.

Lord Dunsany had long been looking for a poet to arise from among the Irish peasants, as Burns sprang from the people of Scotland, when one day a manuscript arrived by post. He will not call Francis Ledwidge the Burns of Ireland, because every true poet is true, first of all, to himself: and if Burns sang of the daisy, Ledwidge sings of the blackbird:

Above me smokes the little town,
With its whitewashed walls and roofs of brown,
And its octagon spire toned smoothly down
As the holy minds within.
And wondrous, impudently sweet,
Half of him passion, half conceit,
The blackbird calls adown the street,
Like the piper of Hamelin.

That is his poetry. He is the poet of natural things—'the world in which our bodies are.' Says Lord Dunsany: 'When they have read through the profounder poets, and seen the problem plays, and studied all the perplexities that puzzle man in the cities, the small circle of readers that I predict for him will turn to Ledwidge as to a mirror reflecting beautiful fields, as to a very still lake rather on a very cloudless evening.'

Ledwidge took part in the great War and fell in it. Lord Dunsany now edits and issues *The Complete Poems of Francis Ledwidge* (Herbert Jenkins; 7s. 6d. net). In the Introduction he guides us to an understanding of the poet, and selects some of the poems for special attention. 'Quite perfect,' he says, 'if my judgment is of any value, is the little poem on page 175, "In the Mediterranean—Going to the War."' This is the poem:

Lovely wings of gold and green
Flit about the sounds I hear,
On my window when I lean
To the shadows cool and clear.

Roaming, I am listening still,
Bending, listening overlong,
In my soul a steadier will,
In my heart a newer song.

Is not this poem on 'Home' quite as near perfection? It was written in Belgium, July 1917:

A burst of sudden wings at dawn,
Faint voices in a dreamy noon,
Evenings of mist and murmurings,
And nights with rainbows of the moon.

And through these things a wood-way dim,
And waters dim, and slow sheep seen
On uphill paths that wind away
Through summer sounds and harvest green.

This is a song a robin sang
This morning on a broken tree,
It was about the little fields
That call across the world to me.

Helen Granville Barker.

Is heredity or environment the chief factor in making us what we are? Helen Granville Barker is much impressed, and puzzled, by the influence of heredity. Her new book is *Songs in Cities and Gardens* (Chatto & Windus; 5s. net). It is quotable (in the pulpit, on the platform, in the home—anywhere, everywhere) from first poem to last. The very last is a prayer which expresses the ideal of a life. But we shall quote:

THE TWO OLD GRANDFATHERS.

My two old grandfathers sat before New England houses
And looked over the fields of grain and wheat,
The apple-orchards, the pastures, the woods and copses,
The swamp land where cattle-prints showed in a black ooze,
The stony hillside where sheep nibbled,
And my two old grandfathers thought their silent thoughts.

[1] R. H. Fisher, *The Outside of the Inside.*

One, gentle, humble, patient, meditated
On the love of God for men, his children;
On the peace of a certain eternity,
The death of self, the brotherhood of man;
On pain as a teacher, and the beauty of holiness
And meek submission to unquestioned creeds.

The other, keen, scoffing, courageous,
Dared to defy the minds of those around him,
Protested, not by words, but independent deeds
Against the blind intolerance of fools,
Read his Voltaire to sound of Sunday church-bells,
Smiled to himself, sitting alone, unasked for,
At the disfavour of men—its weight and value.

Here am I—my hands full of the spoils of cities—
My brain puzzled by creeds and theories,
Groping, bewildered, for truth and justice.
I try to free myself; to rise above conditions,
To think my own thoughts, careless and untrammelled—
But the thoughts of those two old grandfathers
(Sitting alone before New England houses),
Sway, alternately, my inner vision.
I am held and hampered by conflicting forces.

Beatrice Mayor.

There are poets and critics of poetry who refuse the name to that particular form of verse which Beatrice Mayor writes. This is the form:

THE GRASS.

I like the grass.
It listens.
It is kind.
Above all it is calm.
I can say to it all wildnesses,
It will not stir, look up surprised, as friends do.
It listens,
Listens,
Then silently,
Gathers my frenzy to its great green peace,
And I arise.

They say it is too easy to be poetry. Well, try it. *Have* you tried it? And then it affects us. It actually makes the emotional impression upon us which true poetry makes. It gives us pleasure. Here is another example:

WHEN I LOOK OUT.

When I look out
It is not fields I see,
Nor is it hill,
Nor garden,
Nor gracious sky of cloud and peeping blue,
When I look out
I see a wall,
I watch
Sunshine playing with poor weeds upon that wall.
And I am filled
Swiftly,
Miraculously,
With the great careless beauty that is earth's.

The title is *Poems* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net).

Maitland Hardyman.

The photograph in khaki of Lieut.-Col. Maitland Hardyman, D.S.O., M.C., given as frontispiece to *A Challenge* (Allen & Unwin), is that of a mere lad. And he was scarcely four-and-twenty when he was killed at Biefvillers on August 24, 1918. There is a Foreword by Norman Hugh Romanes, who says: 'I have never seen or heard of a man to whom not merely a lie, even a harmless one, but any kind of misrepresentation, was so abhorrent.' And again, 'The brilliant record of his life at the front, first as adjutant, last as commanding officer of a battalion in which all ranks paid him nothing less than homage, is sufficient of itself to prove his contention of the indomitable power of an entirely spiritual personality in the most rigorously practical conditions of life.'

This is a gathering of his poems. He was better than his poetry, but read:

AUSTRALIA'S PRAYER.

(Gallipoli evacuated, December 20th, 1915.)

Jehovah, Lord of all Gethsemanes,
Of thorn-crowned Truth and broken Purposes,
Our stricken motherhood, our tortured brain,
Shrill with the piercing cry, 'Is it in vain?'

No dream of conquest, no mad lust for power,
Found us at England's side in danger's hour,
The Bays of Suvla and of Anzac prove
The strong example of that Greater Love.

Gladly we gave the noblest of our youth
To fight for England and, we thought, for Truth;
Now we are weaker, numbed with constant pain—
Is it in vain, Lord God, is it in vain?

Out of the rending silence God replied:
'You are the triumph I My Son denied,
Have faith, poor soul. Is not all history
Triumphant failure, empty victory?'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Is it all one whether we say 'the Descent into Hades' or 'the Descent into Hell'?

The Rev. Hugh Davis MURPHY, D.D., Rector of St. George's, Belfast, has published five lectures on *The State of the Soul between Death and the Resurrection* (Skeffingtons; 5s. net). And in these lectures he tells us that it makes all the difference whether we say Hades or Hell. To say Hell is to misapprehend the matter. Christ could not have descended into Hell. For there was no Hell. There never has been a Hell, and never will be, until the end of the world.

Not only is there no Hell, there is no Heaven. There is a Heaven where God dwells with the Angels, and where Christ went to dwell when He ascended up on high. But, says Dr. MURPHY, there is no Heaven for you or me, even when we die. There never has been a Heaven for any man or woman born, and never will be, until the end of the world. But at the end of the world there will be both a Heaven and a Hell.

Dr. MURPHY lectures by laying down propositions. His first proposition is this: 'Heaven is the state of the blessed after the General Resurrection, not before. This statement you can verify for yourselves. Search the Scriptures and you will find that the term "Heaven" is never used for the dwelling-place of the Blessed between death and the Day of Judgment. Hence the earliest Christian author whose writings have come down to us after the writings of the New Testament says that they who say that a good man goes to Heaven when he dies are neither Jews nor Christians. He means that neither Jews nor Christians held the belief that the place to which good men go at death is Heaven—Heaven being the place reserved for them after the General Resurrection.'

So there are three states of being for 'us mortals.' 'There are three distinct and separate kinds of existence—(1) That here on this planet where body and soul are united; (2) That of the Intermediate State, where the soul shall exist apart from the body; (3) That of Heaven where the body, having been purified and made fit for immortality, shall once again be united to the soul.'

But 'if the name of Heaven is never given in the Bible to the Dwelling-place of the Blessed between death and the Resurrection, by what name is that place or state called in the Bible?' It is called Paradise. But first of all notice that there is a general name for the abode of all the dead, both bad and good. The name is Hades. Then notice that Hades is divided into two parts or states. Gehenna is the name for the state or abode of the bad. Paradise is the name for the

state or abode of the good. After the General Resurrection there will be the general Judgment. Then the good, clothed upon with the body, will be translated to Heaven, the bad will be sent to Hell. But until then there is no Heaven or Hell for any mere mortal; there is only the Intermediate state called Hades, with its Paradise and its Gehenna.

Christ descended into Hades. There was no Hell for Him to descend to.

Dr. Campbell MORGAN has written a book about preaching. *The Ministry of the Word* he calls it (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). For in that phrase 'is included the whole conception of the work of preaching as distinguished from that of serving tables.' And it is preaching the gospel, not serving tables, that in Dr. Campbell MORGAN's judgment is the supreme need of the hour.

What is this Gospel? Let us get into the heart of Dr. Campbell MORGAN's book. He finds the best summary of it in 'those most familiar, but most sublime words: "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." That,' he says, 'is the Gospel.'

And when he has quoted that 'perfect summary' of the Gospel, he proceeds to analyse it. What does it mean? He finds 'the most perfect analysis' of that perfect summary 'in the words of our Lord concerning the mission of the Spirit in the world, spoken to His disciples in the course of the paschal discourses: "And he, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgement: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more; of judgement, because the prince of this world hath been judged" (Jn 16^{8-11}).'

Sin, righteousness, judgement — why these three? These three, and these only, because when the soul of a man is spiritually wakened these are the things of which it becomes conscious. The awakening may be no more than awakening. It may not result in any change of life. But whenever a spiritual awakening takes place these are the matters of which the soul is conscious—sin, righteousness, judgement.

First, of Sin. For sin is disobedience to God. And when a man is awakened to the fact of God he recognizes God's claim to his obedience and his personal responsibility for disobedience. God is sovereign, and His law is the true standard for human life: Man is capable of obeying God's law —these are the two facts which make disobedience sin. 'Sin fundamentally then is the wilful act of disobedience on the part of man, to the law of the Sovereign Lord to Whom man owes allegiance.'

Next, of Righteousness. Sin and righteousness are opposite. As sin is disobedience to the law of God, righteousness is obedience to it. Righteousness rests upon recognition of the same two facts as sin—the sovereignty of God and the responsibility of man. Righteousness 'fundamentally then is the willing attitude of obedience on the part of man to the good and acceptable and perfect will of God.' The soul of man, spiritually awakened, is conscious at once of the ideal for his life and his failure to reach it. Righteousness is the ideal, sin is the failure.

Then Judgement. For God is not the God of Thomas Carlyle who 'does nothing.' It is of the very nature of God to be doing. And His action is either cursing or blessing. Still as of old are there the two high hills with the sons of men in the valley between—Ebal for cursing because of sin, Gerizim for blessing because of righteousness. Judgement is 'that activity whereby He realizes His purposes, establishes and maintains order. It marks therefore the centre of human responsibility. Righteousness in human life is right relationship with that judgement. Sin is rebellion

against it, which nevertheless cannot escape from its activity. Judgement then in the case of man is that activity of God, wherein He rewards the righteous, and punishes the wicked. The soul of man spiritually awakened comes to this consciousness. It knows that judgement is active.'

It is then that the Gospel comes. It comes to turn the spiritual awakening to sin, righteousness and judgement into loving fellowship with God. Now the Gospel comes by preaching. It is 'the word of the cross.' What is the contents of the preacher's message?

First it is the presentation of the Person of Christ. Not as a philosophical doctrine but as a religious fact. The Christ of the Gospel 'is God manifest, in His character, in His law, in His activity. He is also Man unveiled, in His capacity, in His obedience, in His realization. So also therefore He is the One Whose presence in human history has unmasked evil, as the opposite of all that is in God, and the secret of human undoing.' Men are convicted of sin, 'because they believe not on me.'

The message of the Gospel is, next, the story of the work of Christ. That includes the Cross, the Resurrection, and the Ascension. 'He not only died for our sins, He rose for our justification, and ascended to the right hand of the Father to receive gifts for men. Men, no longer beholding Him with the eyes of sense, may yet be brought into such living fellowship with Him, that in them may be fulfilled the ideal of righteousness. That is the second note of the Gospel.'

Last of all the contents of the preacher's message is the claim of Christ to sovereignty and judgement—the sovereignty of God, the judgement of the World in the victory over the prince of it. The claim of Christ is to complete victory. 'The Stronger than the strong has wrested the usurped sceptre from the enemy; and henceforth He exercises His executive authority, delivering those that are bound, and moving ever triumphantly forward toward the consummation, when He shall deliver up the perfect Kingdom to His Father. This is the final and triumphant note of the Gospel.'

It is a surprise to find a man whose business in life is the Interpretation of the Old Testament challenging the right of the Old Testament to be our guide to God. It is a surprise to light upon the challenge in the introduction to a book on Prayer.

Mr. Conrad A. Skinner, M.A., has written a small book on *Prayer in the Light of the Fatherhood of God* (Heffer), and has persuaded the Reverend Robert Hatch Kennett, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, to write a Foreword to it. In that Foreword Professor Kennett asserts that much 'in the Old Testament is not only incomplete, but altogether inconsistent with the character of God as revealed in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'

'Incomplete' and 'inconsistent'—these are his adjectives. And he defends them. 'We must admit,' he says, 'that there are not a few passages of the Old Testament which imply not merely an incomplete, but an altogether wrong conception of God.' He offers one example 'to justify the assertion.'

It is the example of Elisha and the children. According to 2 Kings $2^{23.\ 24}$ the prophet Elisha was derided by some little boys who called out after him, "Go up, bald head; go up, bald head." Even on the supposition that the baldness which the children mocked at was the artificial baldness of mourning for Elijah, and that in the cry, "Go up," they were making game of the story of Elijah's ascent to heaven, their ribaldry could scarcely have originated with them, but must have been derived from their elders. Yet we are told that Elisha "looked behind him, and saw them, and cursed them in the name of the Lord. And there came

forth two she-bears out of the woods, and tare forty and two children of them.'

It is an ancient obstacle. And it has a way of returning with every generation. Most of us have felt the difficulty of it and have done our best with it and our own conscience. But sometimes to us, handling it according to our several ability, there has come the question, whether it would not be better frankly to give it up, and deny that we were bound by the morality of any such incident in the Old Testament.

For it is only by forgetting Christ that we can make anything of Elisha's curse. Professor KENNETT refuses to forget Christ. He refuses to let us forget Him. 'Contrast with this,' he says, 'another story of One who took the little children up into His arms and blessed them.' He might have added the word on the cross: 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' But taking together the two incidents as he does, Elisha cursing the children and Jesus blessing them, 'it is evident,' he says, 'that a perception of the fundamental difference in the ideas about God implied in these two stories must result in a radical change in our conception of religion.'

But what has all this to do with the doctrine of Prayer? It is in our Lord's doctrine of Prayer that Professor KENNETT finds the best expression of His revelation of God. He taught us to pray, 'Our Father which art in heaven.' The words sweep away that presentation of God 'of which the story of Elisha's cursing the children is an example.' 'I believe,' says Dr. KENNETT, "that the Fatherhood of God" is, as Bishop Moorhouse called it, "the master-thought of Christ's teaching," and that whatever is inconsistent with it should have no place in Christian teaching.'

Canon STREETER has edited another volume of essays. It is similar to 'Foundations,' 'Immortality' and 'Prayer'; and some of the authors are the same. Its title is *The Spirit* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net).

Why is its title *The Spirit*? Why is it not 'The Holy Spirit'? The authors of the volume do not believe in the Holy Spirit.

Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON tells us so. And Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON is the author of the first essay in the volume. He says, 'It is, to my mind, a great misfortune that "the spirit of God," the *influence* of God in the human soul, or, as it is alternatively called in the New Testament, "Christ," "the spirit of Jesus," the mystic presence of the Lord in the hearts of His followers, a spirit of comfort and consolation in their loss, revealing the mind of the Master whom on earth they had often so ill understood, and so guiding them and the Church after them into all truth—it is, I say, a misfortune that expressions like these, and the spiritual fact for which they stand, should have been materialised so as to suggest the existence of a third personality or agency distinct from both the Father and the Son.'

It is a long sentence, but its meaning is unmistakable. There were Christians in Ephesus who had not so much as heard of the existence of a Holy Ghost. Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON has heard of His existence but denies it.

And the rest of the writers agree with him. Says Miss Lily DOUGALL: 'The "Holy Spirit" (observe the inverted commas) is the name given by Christians to *God in action in the world of men.*' The italics are her own.

One of the Persons in the Trinity is thus disposed of. It is true, the authors of the essays do not wholly agree. Dr. Anderson SCOTT speaks of the moment when the Holy Spirit was recognized by the Early Church as personal, and he seems to approve of the recognition. 'Previous to Pentecost it has been regarded as the divine energy in its operation especially upon men—invisible, potent,

somewhat unaccountable. Henceforward, through being discovered to have character, the Spirit is conceived as "personal." It, or as the writers of the New Testament now begin to call it, "He," operates along lines which can be foreseen, because they have been observed already as guiding the activities and the influence of Jesus.'

Shall we say that Dr. Anderson Scott is a theologian and cannot help himself? More significant is the fact that the medical man, Captain J. Arthur Hadfield, M.A., M.B., who writes the purely psychological article on Power, feels the need of the Holy Spirit, and expresses it. His words are worth recording: 'Pentecost, the healing miracles of the Apostolic Age, the triumphant progress of the religion through the Roman Empire, the heroic deeds of saints and martyrs—all these point to the sense of a power newly discovered. In contrast, looking at the Church of to-day, one cannot but be struck with its powerlessness. It contains men of intellect; it produces a type of piety and devotion which one cannot but admire; it sacrifices itself in works of kindness and beneficence; but even its best friends would not claim that it inspires in the world the sense of power. What strikes one rather is its impotence and failure. This want of inspiration and power is associated with the fact that men no longer believe in the existence of the Spirit in any effective practical way. They believe in God the Father, and they are reverent; they believe in the Son, and the Church numbers amongst its members millions who humbly try to "follow in His steps"; but for all practical purposes they are like that little band at Ephesus who had "not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost," and, lacking the inspiration of such a belief, they are weak and wonder why.'

This difference of opinion is unexpected. For we are told that 'a series of conference-retreats, which the majority of contributors were able to attend, supplemented by individual discussion for mutual criticism and information, has made it possible gradually to focus on a single point the results of a first-hand study, not only of Philosophy, Psychology, and the theory of Art, but of the relevant branches of modern scientific Theology.' The editor ignores the difference. But if there was a vote in any of the conference-retreats, he voted with the majority.

He goes further. The majority reduced the Trinity to two Persons, Canon Streeter reduces it to one. And that one is—Christ! He needs more than one sentence to do it, but he does it. '"He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." If so, it must be no less true to say, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Holy Ghost." The Divine which is immanent in man, which speaks to us in the watches of the night—"from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed"—is not other than the Divine which creates and sustains the universe; it is not other than the Divine revealed in Jesus Christ. Orthodox theology, no doubt, would not only admit, but vehemently assert this; but popular Christianity is Tritheism with reservations. The average Christian does not in the first place think of Christ as the "portrait of the Father," still less often does he think of Him as the portrait of the Spirit also. Yet if the fundamental question for religion is, What is God like? and if we are right in affirming that He is like Christ, then we must face all the implications of the statement, and we must apply it to our conception, not only of the Transcendent Divine which traditional theology has styled "the Father," but of the Immanent Divine which has been named the Holy Ghost.'

Testimonium Spiritus Sancti Internum.

By Professor the Reverend James Stalker, D.D., Aberdeen.

Early in the war there was published in Paris a book by one Pescari, a grandson of M. Renan, the author of *The Life of Jesus*. It was introduced to the public by a preface from the pen of M. Bourget, who is, I fancy, among the most eminent of living men of letters in France. And it had the honour of being crowned by the French Academy of Letters. Though issued as a romance, it was understood to contain, under a thin veil, a strongly autobiographical element. It did not deny that the author had been brought up in the sceptical principles of his grandfather, or that, in being launched on the society of literary Paris, he had lived with the freedom too common there. But, becoming a soldier, he was sent out to the part of North Africa in French occupation. Living there in enemy-country, he was disciplined in vigilance and unselfishness by having to consider continually the safety of the men under his charge. Being often on the borders of the Sahara, he acquired habits of meditation, whilst wandering forth from the camp into the safer portions of the surrounding desert. He had always been a reader; but now his reading took a more serious turn, and he became a student of the Bible. One text especially laid hold of his mind—the saying of the centurion who sent for Jesus to come and heal his servant—'For I also am a man set under authority, having under me soldiers: and I say unto one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.' Every action of his daily life threw light on this text, and the text, in turn, threw light on every aspect of the daily routine. It penetrated, however, by degrees far more deeply into his mind; because he seemed to see in it both what the Saviour had done for him and what he might do for the Saviour. When he returned to Paris, he lost no time in letting it be known that he had undergone a spiritual change; and, when his book was published, not only did it exhibit his favourite text on the title-page, but the name it bore was *The Journey of the Centurion*. At the outbreak of the war the author was in the camp at Cherbourg, and he was among the first to be sent to the front. But his career terminated within a fortnight; for he fell in the battle of Rossignol.

In this incident there are many points of interest; but the one on which I wish to fix attention is the part played in it by a verse of Holy Writ. In such spiritual crises it is no unusual thing for a Scripture text to discharge what Socrates would have called a maieutic office. Even where the mind may have been sceptical before, the impression of a divine evidence seems to sweep all doubts away, without the need of scientific inquiry. It is as if God had revealed Himself suddenly with irresistible and immediate testimony: and thenceforth He speaks not only in the particular text, but in His Word as a whole. This is what is called, in theology, the *Testimonium Spiritus Sancti Internum*.

This phrase has a sound of mystery; and it certainly belongs to that aspect of religion in which it is described as 'the secret of the Lord'; yet it ought not to be incapable of theological control. The object of the present article is to furnish a definition which will bring it within the range of theological science; and I will attempt it in the following form: *When the Spirit of God is performing any of His characteristic operations in the spirit of man, any text of scripture embodying the truth which ought then to be filling the mind is apt to come home with unique force and conviction.*

Let this definition be tested by any of the characteristic works of the Holy Spirit. Of these our Lord Himself supplied a list when He said that the Spirit of Truth, when He came, would convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.

First, *the conviction of sin*. This it is the office of the Holy Spirit to produce, and He may do it through a great variety of means. For days or weeks or years the awakening of the conscience may have been becoming more and more intense. Now, when the mind is in this condition through the operation of the Holy Spirit, any text of Scripture, describing sin as God sees it and setting forth its guilt and punishment, is apt to come home with overwhelming power.

Of this we have a memorable instance in the

case of St. Augustine. Living at the time when heathenism was giving place all over the Roman Empire to Christianity, he was caught between the two opposite influences. His father was a heathen, living with the freedom of a pagan; and Augustine was a pagan himself, living in a connexion which Roman morality did not disallow, but Christianity sternly condemned. His mother, on the contrary, was a Christian in whom the new religion had done its most perfect work. Well did the son know that he was prayed for every day, and that she was watching for his conversion. Other powerful influences of a Christian kind were brought to bear on him when, at the age of about thirty years, he went, as a teacher of rhetoric, to Milan, then the second capital of Italy and an imperial residence. The bishop of the city was St. Ambrose, now reckoned along with Augustine among the four great teachers of the Latin Church. At first Augustine went to hear him on account of the elegance of his Latinity and the eloquence of his delivery; but it was not long before his attention was captured by the truth itself. Under the preaching of Ambrose remarkable conversions were taking place in very high circles. One day an acquaintance, calling on Augustine and finding him engaged in reading the Epistles of St. Paul, expressed surprise at seeing him thus occupied; but, when Augustine confessed that he was now a reader of this kind of literature, the visitor testified that he had recently become a Christian himself; and he went on to mention other cases of young men in the imperial service who, in circumstances of extreme difficulty and at great sacrifice, had just confessed Christ. By this recital Augustine was so profoundly moved that, when the visitor took his leave, he turned to Alypius, a friend with whom he lodged, crying, 'What is it? What is wrong with us? Didst thou hear what he said? The uneducated are taking heaven by storm; but we, in spite of our learning, are wallowing in sensuality.' There was a garden behind the house, into which he moved quickly, followed by Alypius, and, sitting down, he went on talking in the same strain. But, feeling a rush of tears coming on, he was hastening alone to a remoter part of the garden when he heard from a house on one side of the garden the voice of a boy or girl, probably engaged in some game, saying, '*Take up and read, Take up and read.*' In his excited condition he interpreted this as a divine command to go back to the house and read the book with which he had been occupied. Hastily retracing his steps, he glanced at the roll, and the very first words which met his eye were Ro. $13^{13.14}$: 'Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying; but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.' It will be seen that these words struck straight at the besetting sin in which he was entangled; and the sword of the Spirit proved the weapon required to cut his bonds, which fell at his feet, allowing him to step forth free; and he lost not an hour in communicating to his mother the blessed news that all her prayers had been answered. There had been going on for years a process of conviction; but now this came suddenly to a head. God Himself was passing judgment on his sin; but at the same moment God gave him the power to abandon and despise the evil habit. Never afterwards did Augustine doubt that God had spoken to him in the words of this text, and the divinity and authority of this one word extended themselves to all the words of Scripture.

Secondly, *righteousness*. If the conversion of St. Augustine is an illustration of the conviction of sin, equally is that of Luther connected with righteousness. Luther had, indeed, been long himself under the conviction of sin, though in a very different form from Augustine's; and this discipline of the Holy Ghost led on to something higher, culminating in a passionate conviction that righteousness was the all-in-all which he must obtain, if he was to live. To enjoy the favour and approval of God had come to appear to him the one thing worth seeking; and he was searching the universe, to know where he might find it.

It was in this state of mind that he came upon the text in the first chapter of Romans: 'For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith.' The position in which this verse stands seemed to guarantee that it would contain the solution of the problem of salvation; for he already knew, from the grasp he had obtained of the general drift of Scripture and from the anticipations growing in his spiritual nature, that the gospel must be not of works, but through the grace of God alone. He was, however, for a long time completely baffled by the traditional interpretation,

which made 'righteousness' in this passage to be an attribute of God; for, as thus taken, it yielded no sense or connexion with what goes before or comes after. But, when it dawned on him, being probably suggested by some scholar or commentator, that 'the righteousness of God' here means a righteousness provided by God and given for nothing to sinful man, his mind was flooded with light, and this verse shone ever afterwards as a revelation sent to him in his despair, not only to remove his depression, but to fill him with gladness and thankfulness.

There was in this case no stumbling on the text, as in Augustine's. On the contrary, Luther had long been pondering this very passage and bringing to bear on it all the resources of learning and mental energy at his command; and this proves that there is no special virtue in the surprise or fortuitousness with which a text may present itself to the inquiring mind. On the contrary, the more knowledge of Scripture there is in the mind, the better; and, the more the Scripture is studied, the more likely is it to yield what is required at every exigency. The point to be noted, however, is that the Spirit of God, who had Luther's spirit in hand, used the witness of a great text to terminate his anxious inquiry and give him complete mental satisfaction. It would be a profitable task to collect the passages of Scripture which have been most used in this way in the course of centuries; and it would be found that, while unlikely passages have sometimes been used to bring peace, those most frequently employed for this purpose are the deepest and most gracious messages in the Word of God, wherein God offers His Son, or the Son offers Himself, as the Saviour of sinners. It is not, however, unusual for even the most hackneyed texts of this kind to present themselves to the mind in such circumstance as spiritual discoveries of the greatest novelty, the simplest elements of gospel-truth dawning on the mind with all the freshness of revelation; and this seems to prove that the apprehension of the truth is not a common act of the understanding, but a conviction brought home by the action of the Spirit of God. This is not, however, to be ascribed to any outflashing of supernatural light in the moment when the passage of Scripture is read or heard, though the subject of the experience is apt to describe it so, but rather to the state of soul into which the person has been brought through the antecedent operation of the Holy Ghost.

Thirdly, *judgment.* The whole course of a Christian life, from the initial experiences just described to the consummation when, at death, the soul, made perfect in holiness, passes out of this world, may be comprehended under the term 'judgment'; for the conduct in which it consists is a daily and hourly judging of what is right and what is wrong, what is wise and what otherwise, what is excellent and what is more excellent. The approval and the choice of what is in accordance with the will of God may be said to form the path of progress which has to be trodden.

The Spirit of God, however, has also the business in hand; for the perfecting of the saints involves His glory quite as much as it does their welfare. There are two ways in which He leads forward those who have committed themselves to His guidance. On the one hand, He is leading by Providence and, on the other, by the Word. His providence extends to every incident of a human experience, and He is pledged to make all things work together for good. On the other hand, He is also daily guiding by the Word, making it a light to the feet and a lamp to the path, so that nothing escapes from its illumination. These two operations go together and work into each other. Every day the providential leading raises questions in the exercised mind, and the reading of the Word supplies the answers. Everyone who is in the way of seriously committing the course of his life to God, and at the same time daily reading the Word of God, is aware how wonderfully the two fit into each other, the course of Providence demanding the enlightenment of the Word, and the Word interpreting the riddles of daily duty. The pilgrim knows that his path is not of his own choosing, but intended by a higher wisdom for the development of character, and the daily reader of the Word of God knows how it seems to be expressly fashioned for the situations into which Providence brings him. If there be in our human existence such a thing as an authentic divine voice audible to man, it is this interpretation of Providence by Scripture.

It is not, however, all plain travelling for any pilgrim on this journey. The path gets darkened and confused by both error within and misleading voices without—by the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the pride of life—by the world,

the flesh and the devil. This is what we call temptation or what Jesus, in the passage where He spoke of 'judgment,' characterized as 'the prince of this world.' The classical example of resistance to such onsets of the powers of evil is the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness; and it is well known what a decisive part, on that occasion, was played by the Word of God. It was by wielding this sword of the Spirit that Jesus discomfited the tempter. It is not to be thought that the words of Scripture, in this incident, came to His relief in any way different from that in which similar ones may come to any other tempted human being. In all probability He had learned them all by heart, storing them up in His memory; and word of Scripture learned by anyone in this way are like the arrows in a quiver, ready to be used as occasion may require. No doubt, however, each, as it arose in the mind of the Son of Man, would be identified with a glow of delight as a weapon supplied by the Spirit for the occasion, and would be remembered afterwards as a word stamped and sealed with the testimony of God Himself. At any rate, this is what takes place in our experience; and such victories are like flags marking the progress of Christian attainment.

It is not solely, however, in private experience that this interpretation of Providence by Scripture, and of Scripture by Providence, takes place: the same thing is experienced on the larger scale of society. There is a German proverb that the history of the world is the judgment of the world (*Der Welt Geschichte ist der Welt Gericht*); and those who study present-day history in a religious spirit can use for its interpretation the Word of God. Many do so, and find the application of Scripture to events national or international no less remarkable than its bearing on those of private life. During the War multitudes of Christians have been reading the news brought from the seats of war day by day in this light, and they have had no difficulty in discovering the manifest tokens of divine judgment. Especially in the final passages was this searching light almost painfully visible; and, when principalities and powers were swept from their places, and the greatest of them all had to go begging for an asylum in a foreign land, who could fail to remember the passage in Isaiah where, on the arrival of the king of Babylon in the world of shades, the mighty kings of bygone generations rise from their thrones, to greet him and ask with astonishment, 'Art thou become like unto us?' Only let us be glad that the fallen monarch in the present case still lives and may, therefore, through the process of judgment, now impending, be granted repentance unto life.

The *Testimonium Spiritus Sancti Internum* may be said to have been restored to Christendom, or at least to theological thought in this country, by the late William Robertson Smith, Professor of Hebrew in Aberdeen. In the process of introducing to the knowledge of his countrymen the modern Biblical Criticism, he had to take up positions irreconcilable with the current ways of stating and defending the inspiration of the Bible; but he appealed from these to older views on the same subject, which, he maintained, had been those of the Reformers and even of the divines of our own country by whom the confessional books were framed by which so-called heterodox opinions have now to be tested. The cumbrous modes of proof for the divinity of Scripture, of which errorlessness is the central feature, were, he held, the invention of a later age — of post-Reformation orthodoxy—but he proposed to lead the Church back to the faith of a time when the perception of the divine was more direct and intuitive. 'If I am asked,' he stated, 'why I receive Scripture as the Word of God, and as the only perfect rule of faith and life, I answer, with all the Fathers of the Protestant Church: Because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God, because in the Bible alone I find God drawing near to man in Christ Jesus, and declaring to us, in Him, His will for our salvation. And this record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart, whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words to my soul.'

On turning in the direction in which the accused professor pointed, scholarly minds found the facts to be as he had stated. Calvin, for example, passes very lightly over the arguments for the divinity of Scripture derived from such testimonies as those of prophecy and miracles, but reposes with perfect security on the internal witness of the Spirit of God; and this is the more remarkable for two reasons—first, because he undertook more than any other of the Reformers to derive everything directly from God's Word, for the authority of which he might, therefore, have been ready to accept every kind of external support; and,

secondly, because, like the other Reformers, he was confronted by those then termed Anabaptists, who appealed to the inner light, with which Calvin's appeal might have been supposed to have considerable affinity. Even more surprised, however, were inquiring minds to find that in the symbolic documents of the Presbyterian Church the authority of Scripture is based, not on errorlessness, but on more interior qualities, and especially on the testimony of the Spirit of God.

The aim of Professor Robertson Smith was probably pretty faithfully expressed by one of his friends and supporters, who, at the time, issued a pamphlet bearing the title *The Bible Independent of Criticism.* He wished to place the Church in a position from which she could regard with equanimity the operation of both literary and historical criticism. While rejecting the distinction, which some scholars before him had adopted, that the Bible *is* not God's Word, but *contains* God's Word, he distinguished between 'the general veracity of the Bible as a credible account of the historical origins of our religion, which is to be proved by the ordinary methods of historical evidence, and the infallible truth of the divine Word, the spiritual doctrine, the revelation of God Himself, which is the substance of the record.' 'So long as we go to Scripture only to find in it God and His redeeming love, mirrored before the eye of faith, we may rest assured, that we shall find living, self-evidencing, infallible truth in every part of it, and that we shall find nothing else.'

I have never felt quite sure that the thesis of Professor Candlish, the friend of Professor Robertson Smith above alluded to, that the Bible is independent of criticism, can be maintained. It is independent of a sane and reasonable criticism; but unfortunately all criticism is not of this character; and it would not be necessary to go far to find examples of a style of criticism which, if the charges brought by it against the Scriptures could be substantiated, would negative beforehand every claim to divine authority. There is, for example, a criticism of the Old Testament to which the suggestion would not be alien or abhorrent that the Book of the Law discovered in the Temple by Josiah and his friends not only was the Book of Deuteronomy, but was found there because they had themselves put it there, and was palmed off by them as something which they well knew it not to be. There is a criticism of the New Testament which does not allow more than seven of the words of Christ to be indubitable and thus robs the great and precious promises which proceeded out of His mouth of the direct authority of the Saviour. If such were the real character of the Bible as a whole, I venture to say, it would be the duty of honest scholarship, not to help Dagon to his feet, but to smash the idol. The very least that Christian Apologetics must be held responsible for is to prove that the writers of Scripture desired to tell the truth and succeeded in doing so. This may not, indeed, have precluded certain infirmities in the human authors, the results of which have not been obliterated; but these no more interfere with the transmission of the divine message than the various readings which have crept in during the transmission of the book to modern times —this comparison is Professor Robertson Smith's, and these are almost his very words—but the total result is worthy of the God of truth. The notion that the Bible is independent of criticism makes the task of the apologete too easy, tempting him to fall asleep at his post, like a general so confident that the citadel is safe that he neglects to defend the outworks through which it is to be attacked; and it has, in fact, encouraged a habit of bringing against the Bible charges of inaccuracy and personation with a recklessness never displayed towards any other literature under the sun.

Professor Robertson Smith was wont to distinguish between the divine communication of God's heart and will in the Bible and the record of it, much in the same way in which anyone might distinguish between a letter and the envelope in which it is conveyed, though I do not remember that he himself made use of this illustration. Even the envelope, however, of a letter is not a negligible quantity to persons of taste. In shape and colour it must be congruous with the sheets within. If it come from a lofty quarter, such as a government office or a king's court, it is likely to bear some mark or stamp by which it is dignified. And so, if the Bible be what it claims to be—a message from the King of kings and the Lord of lords—it is likely to bear even external indications of its high origin, and these it is the task of Apologetics to point out.

But the letter, not the envelope, is the thing; and the merit of Professor Robertson Smith consisted in the clearness with which he defined this

divine essence in the Bible and claimed for it unique authority. The very name of Apologetics, as well as the place usually assigned to this discipline in a theological curriculum, would seem to suggest that the ordinary work of the apologete is of a preliminary and introductory nature, belonging to the region of probability and possibility; it is external and intended for the outsider. But Christianity can claim, and ought to claim, to have Apologetics of quite a different order—not for the outsider, but for the insider, not external and merely probable, but internal, experimental and demonstrative. When, in the ways discussed above, the Scripture has, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, convinced of sin, righteousness and judgment—when the reader finds that, the more he reads the Bible, the better he grows, and that, the better he grows, the more he reads it; and when this continues for a lifetime with a growing sense of reality and blessedness—then there forms itself in the mind an assurance of conviction about the Bible and its truth which the happy possessor is apt to compare with the certainty of the axioms of geometry, and which, at least he can say sometimes, fills him with a joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Literature.

MRS. GLADSTONE.

The biography of Mrs. Gladstone, which her daughter Mrs. Mary Drew has written—*Catherine Gladstone* (Nisbet; 12s. 6d. net)—is more than a surprise. It is a revelation. Everybody knew Mrs. Gladstone as the devoted wife of the great British statesman, and she was as devoted as we understood her to be. There is an amusing anecdote of her interest in his speeches in the House of Commons. It is quoted from the *Recollections of an Irish Judge*:

'In the House one day I noticed, looking at the Ladies' Gallery, that a small patch of the dull brass grille shone like burnished gold. I asked an attendant if he could explain it. "That," said he, "is the place where Mrs. Gladstone sits to watch the Grand Old Man whenever he speaks—she rests one hand on the grating, and the friction, as you see, has worn it bright."'

Yes, she was devoted. What she was to him, what difference her devotion made to him and to the world, history is unable to tell. But she was more than an adoring and self-sacrificing wife. She was a woman, we see now, of an independent mind and an exceedingly rich individuality. Her presence was itself a power. She was a queen and moved as a queen among gladly obedient subjects. Her humour and her emotional sympathy went well together, like high-bred horses. Her gift of giving was a Godlike endowment. And her womanliness was always the first and the most penetrating impression. How often did she meet a difficult situation by readiness of resource:

'Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone had flitted up to London during the Recess, and were staying in Harley Street for a day or two—there was practically no household, and they had arranged to go to luncheon with their next-door neighbour. They were on the point of starting when the bell rang and Lord Granville was shown in. "Can you give me some luncheon?" he said. Mr. Gladstone was just about to explain that unfortunately there was no luncheon, and that they were going out for luncheon. What was his surprise when Mrs. Gladstone broke in before he could answer—"Oh yes, dear Lord Granville, too delighted to have you." Such was her husband's confidence in her powers of resource, that he veiled his astonishment and drew Lord Granville into the empty dining-room for his talk.

'Like a scene in a play, presently the door opened; footmen entered with trays; the cloth was laid, the table dressed, the butler brought in wine, etc. Mrs. Gladstone had quietly slipped out of the house and brought back with her the whole contingent—hostess, servants, and food—from next door. Chuckling with delight, Mr. Gladstone seated himself at the head of the table, and turning to his hostess, now by a miracle changed into his guest: "May I have the pleasure of giving you some of this excellent pie? I have special reason for highly commending it," etc. etc.'

The biography is more than a success as a

biography: it is a gift to the nation. It is, as it professes to be, a biography of Mrs. Gladstone, but of course there is much of insight into the character of Mr. Gladstone himself. Mrs. Benson (the Archbishop's widow) went to see him as he lay dying. 'I knelt by him and took his hand. M.D. said, "Here is Mrs. Benson." He took my hand and kissed it, and said, "God bless you. Will you give me your prayers?" I said how he always had them—how I prayed continuously for him. "Nobody," he said, "needs your prayers more than the poor sinner who lies here before you." This rang out in his magnificent voice—no alteration in that; then he went on, "I often think of your husband; perhaps he pities me now." I said, "He loves you now as he did always," and I kissed his hand which was still holding mine. He blessed me again and I came away. You will know all it was—sight and sound and words.'

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF ST. PAUL.

It is a tradition in this country to include a translation of the Letters of St. Paul along with his Life, and Professor David Smith has followed it. The result is a very bulky book of seven hundred pages. It would have looked better in two volumes, after the manner of Lewin, Conybeare and Howson, and Farrar, but in these days few authors can be afforded the luxury of a two-volume book. The publishers have done their best by printing it on a light paper. The title is *The Life and Letters of St. Paul* (Hodder & Stoughton; 21s. net).

The Christian world is not so much interested in St. Paul as in his Master. Farrar did not repeat in his St. Paul the phenomenal success of his Life of Christ, nor will Dr. Smith repeat the circulation of 'The Days of His Flesh." But we should be easily persuaded to believe that the second book cost him more than the first. For one thing there is more theology in it, and notwithstanding that Dr. Smith is a Professor of Theology, he is not so happy in the exposition of doctrine as he is in the interpretation of experience. Once and again, as in the explanation of the phrase 'in Adam all die' there is found a labour to bring forth that is quite absent from the easy delivery seen in the interpretation of the great Gospel sayings. There is no doubt that the apostolic conception of death has been misunderstood and has to be rescued from the misunderstanding: what we miss is not theological apprehension but lightness of touch.

There are passages in the book which raise a doubt if Professor Smith is as sympathetic towards the Apostle as the best biographer has to be. Take this passage: 'It is a grievous fault of the Apostolic Church that she was deaf to her Lord's admonition and clung to her impatient expectation of an immediate Advent, involving herself, as the years passed, in ever deeper embarrassment and bewilderment; and it must be confessed that the prime responsibility rests with Paul. It was he who imported into Christian theology that Rabbinical notion which has persisted to this day and has so often served the unhallowed uses of controversial warfare. It is alien from the teaching of our Blessed Lord. He foretold indeed the rise of false Christs and false prophets amid the confusion of the Jewish state as the already inevitable catastrophe of her destruction by the Romans approached; but the eschatological programme of a final apostasy and a scenic triumph is a picturesque fiction of the later Jewish theology. And it is instructive that, though the Apostle John accepted it in the Book of Revelation and recognized the Antichrist as Nero *redivivus*, he presently abandoned the wild dream. In his First Epistle, the latest of his writings, where he deals with the Cerinthian heresy, he defines the Antichrist as a spirit or principle—the Doketic denial of the reality of the Incarnation; and since that principle found various expressions, he recognized many Antichrists in his day. This rendering of the idea won a measure of acceptance, and it still had its advocates in St. Augustine's day; but unfortunately the cruder notion maintained its ground and prevailed.'

Dr. Smith has been wise to omit all 'problems' and proceed. There is no interruption of the story in order to discuss the date of the Council. All these matters are consigned to an Appendix. And that Appendix, though its title is 'Pauline Chronology,' is an essential and valuable portion of the book.

CHARLES HAMILTON SORLEY.

An attractive volume containing *The Letters of Charles Sorley*, with a chapter of Biography, has

been issued at the Cambridge University Press (12s. 6d. net).

Charles Sorley was one of twin sons of Professor W. R. Sorley of Cambridge. He was educated at Marlborough College, and spent some months in Germany. On the outbreak of the war he just escaped, and reached home on August 6. 'The next morning he applied to the University Board of Military Studies for a commission in the Army, and his application was transmitted to the War Office. Then followed a period of irksome delay during which he went to Oxford and made another application there. He was just about to enlist as a private, which he always said was the really heroic thing to do, when he saw his name in the *Gazette* as second lieutenant in the seventh battalion —the first of the new "service" battalions—of the Suffolk Regiment. That day he had orders to join a training camp at Churn on the Berkshire downs —"first cousins to the Wiltshire downs," as he called them. In the third week of September he joined his battalion at Shorncliffe above Folkestone. Again he was happy in his fate. He quickly realized the great history and traditions of the regiment — the "Old Dozen" — and made friends among the officers and men. We visited him for a week-end in February 1915 while he was doing a musketry course at Hythe, which he thoroughly enjoyed. During a stormy walk on The Leas he stopped suddenly and pointed across to Shorncliffe. "That's where Napoleon was beaten," he said, "at Sir John Moore's musketry school"; and then, sweeping his hand down seaward, "and that's where the Kaiser will be beaten —at Hythe."

'In the end of May the battalion was sent to France at last. Charlie was then lieutenant; in August he was gazetted captain; in September there was a prospect of leave. His service during these months was chiefly in the trenches round Ploegsteert. After the opening of the Battle of Loos the battalion was moved south to take part in the offensive. In the night of 12th–13th October it took over front-line trenches in readiness for the morrow's attack; and he fell on the afternoon of the 13th, shot in the head by a sniper, as he led his company at the "hair-pin" trench near Hulluch.'

Charles Sorley was not a precocious child. He did not become a bookworm (though he met a specimen of that lower animal in Germany and felt some awful admiration). He was not an athlete. He was a healthy boy, in body and in mind, who did most things easily and did them well, and held his head high. His letters are good reading. There is imagination and there is humour, a valuable combination, and there is the clean mind.

THE ATONEMENT.

The Very Reverend Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt., D.C.L., LL.D., Dean of Carlisle, is a broad churchman of very great learning and power. Appointed Bampton Lecturer for 1915 he lectured on *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology* (Macmillan; 15s. net). He lectured with courageous clearness. For he knew that his own idea of Atonement was very different from that of 'Christian Theology.'

What is Dean Rashdall's idea of Atonement? It is Abelard's idea. He gives it in the words in which Peter the Lombard formulated it: 'So great a pledge of love having been given us, we are both moved and kindled to love God who did such great things for us; and by this we are justified, that is, being loosed from our sins we are made just. The death of Christ therefore justifies us, inasmuch as through it charity is stirred up in our hearts.'

That without criticism or comment, without addition or subtraction, is what the Dean of Carlisle understands by the Atonement of Christ.

And that is not Atonement. If that is what is meant by the Atonement of Christ we had better drop the name by which we have known it. Dr. Rashdall is quite willing to drop the name. He thinks it should have been dropped long ago. What name should be used he does not say. He does not need to say. That which is nothing does not need a name.

How did the Church ever begin to speak of atonement? You expect, perhaps, that the Dean of Carlisle will lay the blame on St. Paul. He does not. St. Paul 'received' it from the Church. The idea arose in the few years (Dr. Rashdall says it may have been only one year) that elapsed between the death of Jesus and the conversion of St. Paul. 'Jewish prophecy was the source of the idea. The early Christians came to believe that Christ had died that sins might be forgiven because they found it, as they thought, distinctly foretold that He should do so in books which they regarded as

in the most literal and plenary sense inspired writings.'

But is there no idea of atonement in the Gospels? There is not. And as Dr. Rashdall proceeds to prove that there is not, you feel how possible and even how easy it is for a man to prove anything out of the Gospels that he wants to prove. The method is simple. Choose first of all the passages that make for your own opinion; then deny the genuineness of the passages that make against it.

Dr. Rashdall finds two passages, and two only, absolutely in his way—the words 'the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many,' and the words of the institution of the Supper. He cannot quite get rid of the first passage without getting rid of the Gospels, so he boldly says that after all, even if genuine, they do not mean atonement. The other passage he disposes of easily by taking St. Luke's to be the only true version.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF GOD.

The Manuscripts of God is the title which Mr. A. I. Tillyard has given to a book of Christian apologetic (Cambridge: Heffer; 10s. 6d. net). It might have been delivered at a Scottish University as one of the Gifford Lectures. For it fulfils Lord Gifford's conditions to the letter. Revelation is left out. The determination was made to see what could be said for the Christian interpretation of the universe on strictly scientific lines. It is a book of 'natural religion.' And its effectiveness is a surprise.

It does not carry us all the way. In the last sentence we are promised 'another volume.' But it carries us so far along the way as to give us a Pisgah-sight of the Promised Land. And it carries us securely, steadily, reasonably, every part of our personality in exercise and at its height.

Man, Nature, History—separately and then together they lead us along the lines of evolution to the perfect Man, Christ Jesus. We know no higher; we can conceive no higher.

Along the lines of evolution. And yet evolution is not the rigid antithesis to creation it has so long been supposed to be: 'When I was young it used to be said that Darwin had made mincemeat of the theory of special creation—that is, the kind of creation described in the first chapter of Genesis. So he undoubtedly had, but mince is still meat, however small it is cut. In the last extract we have two eminent scientists admitting that variation is still creation, only on an extremely small scale, while mutations and apparent breaks in the order of Nature are creation on a larger scale. In fact the latest name for evolution is *epigenesis*, or "the continuous creation of what is essentially new." We thus get back to Genesis at the low price of a Greek preposition. The old idea reappears in a new guise. Nor is the wonder of the process lessened because things are made to make other and different things, for that is the meaning of the paradox that "the essence of the creature is its innate creativeness."'

THE VOICE OF LINCOLN.

Mr. R. M. Wanamaker, a Judge of the Supreme Court of Ohio, has made a study of Lincoln as a leader of men, and has published the result as *The Voice of Lincoln* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net).

It is a biography of character, not of event. The character is Lincoln's, but the author of the book has the further thought of expressing the American ideal, the ideal of democracy. That thought is not allowed to interfere with the personal presence. It is Abraham Lincoln that is with us all through the book. But Abraham Lincoln, and not George Washington, is now the representative American, the man of men whom America admires and calls upon its sons and daughters, saying, 'Go, and do thou likewise.'

And there are few men in the history of the world better fitted to be an example. He had no definite religious belief, it is said. But it is said untruly. It was only the form into which belief has to be thrown that he could not find. The man was as religious as he was moral, and he was both moral and religious in so high a degree that just his religion and his morality, and not any separable gift of genius, made him a leader of men. Wherever he came, in those long years of obscurity, men trusted him, and men do not put their trust in mere ability.

PERSIAN TALES.

Persian Tales, written down for the first time in the original Kermānī and Bakhtiārī, and translated by D. L. R. Lorimer and E. O. Lorimer, with

illustrations by Hilda Roberts (Macmillan; 20s. net)—that is the title-page of one of the most attractive books which the present publishing season has produced. Its attractiveness is manifold. The publishers have been able to use beautiful white paper; they have chosen a small quarto size with generous but not wasteful margins; and they have bound the book with an artistic simplicity that is irresistible. Then there is the attraction of the illustrations. No other 'tale' book has their like. They are Persian, and they are Persian with a venturesome dash of the unearthly. The coloured plates catch the eye and satisfy it. Very effective is their reality and unreality, so impossible is it to say which is which. But even the smallest pen and ink inset has individuality; and not only individuality, but if it is a human being, humanity, if an animal, animality. There is the general as well as the particular in one sketch. The tales come last. They are not to be described. It is enough that they are the genuine folk-tales of a people that is neither Arabic nor Indian.

PASTEUR.

The issue of a new and cheap edition of *The Life of Pasteur* (Constable; 10s. 6d. net) is an opportunity to make the acquaintance of one of the best biographies of one of the best men of the Nineteenth Century. One of the best biographies—it will rank with the Life of Arnold, the Life of Kingsley, the Life of Watts, or the Life of Lister. Its author is René Vallery-Radot. It has been translated by Mrs. R. L. Devonshire.

One of the best men also. He was France's foremost scientist, we might say citizen, but he was home-loving and God-loving in greater measure and beauty than he was great in science or in patriotism.

What did he do in science? He discovered the origin of the mischief that was ruining the beer industry, the wine industry, the silk industry, the cattle trade, and all that before he discovered the hydrophobia microbe and delivered mankind from that terrifying disease.

He was a home lover. His father, a working tanner, had been a sergeant in the Peninsular War and wore the ribbon of the Legion of Honour. When the village people placed a memorial plate on the house in the town of Dôle where he was born he spoke of his father and mother and said, 'Thy enthusiasm, my brave-hearted mother, thou hast instilled it into me. If I have always associated the greatness of Science with the greatness of France, it is because I was impregnated with the feelings that thou hadst inspired. And thou, dearest father, whose life was as hard as thy hard trade, thou hast shown to me what patience and protracted effort can accomplish. It is to thee that I owe perseverance in daily work.'

And he was a religious man. One statement will be enough. 'Pasteur, less preoccupied than Chappuis by philosophical discussions, soared without an effort into the domain of spiritual things. Absolute faith in God and in Eternity, and a conviction that the power for good given to us in this world will be continued beyond it, were feelings which pervaded his whole life; the virtues of the Gospel had ever been present to him. Full of respect for the form of religion which had been that of his forefathers, he came to it simply and naturally for spiritual help in these last weeks of his life.'

SOUTH AFRICA.

Messrs. Allen & Unwin have issued another illustrated edition of the first volume of Dr. George McCall Theal's History of South Africa. The volume stands by itself with its own title, *Ethnography and Condition of South Africa before A.D. 1505* (8s. 6d. net). The three races (if they can be called races) described in it are the Bushmen, the Hottentots, and the Bantu. The volume takes the story of South Africa from the earliest remains and records that have been unearthed down to the discovery of the country by Europeans.

This edition has been 'enlarged and improved.' For every year is now adding to our knowledge and testing our conclusions. There are questions which have been finally settled. There is no longer any doubt that the Katia, a curious little lonely group found in Betshuanaland with an offshoot in the Kalahari desert, formerly believed to be a remnant of the earliest inhabitants of South Africa, are of mixed blood and recent origin. They are the offspring of Bushmen and Bantu women taken captive in war and do not go further back than four or five generations. Being of mixed blood they were treated as outcasts by both the tribes from which they sprang, and this treat-

ment brought about their present degradation. The solution of their mystery is due to the researches of Miss Bleek (whose father did so much for the study of South African ethnology). Dr. Theal notes the interesting fact about the small band of the Katia who lived in the Kalahari desert, that they 'hardly knew the use of water, for there was none in that locality, and depended entirely upon wild melons for the means of quenching thirst.'

Other problems, however, are still unsolved. Where was the original home of the Bushmen? The two leading authorities are Dr. L. Peringuey, Director of the South African Museum, and Dr. W. J. Sollas, Professor of Geology and Palæontology in the University of Oxford, and they take opposite sides. 'Dr. Peringuey believes in Africa, and he gives reasons for his conclusion that members of the Bushman race migrated to Europe at a time so remote that there was a passage by dry land over the centre of what is now the Mediterranean sea.' 'Professor Sollas, on the contrary, holds that the migration was from Europe to Africa, and assigns it to the same remote period as Dr. Peringuey. He gives a graphic description of the Bushmen in Southern Europe, who lived there in what is termed the Aurignacian period, nearly in the middle of the palæolithic or rough stone age.'

Messrs. Nisbet have issued *The Church Directory and Almanack* (5s. net), and *The Church Pulpit Year Book* (3s. 6d. net) for 1920. The Year Book contains a complete set of sermon outlines for the Sundays of the year, outlines for Saints' Days, Children's Services, Men's Services, and Special Occasions. At the end of many of the outlines there are Notes, well worth the space they occupy.

The Directory is as miraculously accurate as ever. It is worth recording that in the nineteen years of its existence we have not found a single misprint though we have used it constantly every year of the nineteen. It is a book that grows in bulk with the year, but as it grows in bulk it grows in usefulness.

In *The New Outlook* (Allen & Unwin; 1s. net) Lord Robert Cecil has a word, and it is a wise word, to say on the chief problems which await solution to-day. He touches the League of Nations first, then Industry, Finance, Parliament, and Ireland.

If the essays of our day are marked by thinness of thought, one volume stands apart. Every sentence—yes, every sentence—of *The Hidden Happiness*, by Stephen Berrien Stanton (Allenson; 5s. net), is the exact expression of a thought that is worth expressing. The book is not to be read at a gallop. For once you must read and think, and think and read, and it will be ten times better for you than ten times the same amount of reading elsewhere. To give a notion of the thoughtfulness of it one might quote isolated sentences, as: 'The further we move away from Christ's times, the closer we approach his truth,' or 'Perfection is attained by not waiting for perfection,' or 'In strange contrast to the generosity of youthful hearts is the unconcern of youthful eyes,' or 'Progress is the movement of the wave, not of the water'; but then we lose the context and the connexion—a very great deduction from the weight of the saying.

The man needs courage as well as knowledge who is to handle successfully in the pulpit the great moral problems of pain; prayer, providence, miracles, atonement, personality, and immortality; and the more knowledge perhaps the more courage. The Rev. J. W. G. Ward, Minister of New Court Congregational Church in London, has had the courage, and we think he has the knowledge. In *Problems that Perplex* (Allenson; 5s. net) he publishes his lectures on all those problems and four or five besides. He is a convinced believer in God's direct action and from that all else flows—if we will give it a fair chance and channel. He believes that Jesus wrought His miracles by means of a higher law than we possess, but still by law, and he believes that we shall possess it yet. Then walking on the water will be as 'natural' as walking on the earth.

We must do all that lies in us to make the League of Nations a reality. We must believe in it, work for it, write upon it, preach about it. And one arm of our advocacy may be the futility of the crime of war. Arguments in the form of quotations from great wise men will be found in plenty in a handsome volume which Messrs. Daniel have published. Its title is *The Indictment of War*

(10s. 6d. net). It has been compiled by H. S. Redgrove, B.Sc., and Jeanne Heloïse Rowbottom. The authors are quoted alphabetically from Abdul Baha to Israel Zangwill.

Here is a good moral maxim from Noah Worcester: 'In all instances of war between nations, and dissensions between parties in the same nation or society, both parties appear almost totally blind to their own faults. Each party will censure the same things in the other, of which they themselves are flagrantly guilty, and not appear sensible of the least inconsistency. Moreover, it is no uncommon thing for people to be so sure that there is no wrong on their own part, as to suspect the friendship of their real friends, if they are so faithful and kind as to endeavour to show them their faults.'

The last sentence in the book is a quotation by Zangwill from Heine: 'From the lie there comes no life,' said Heine, 'and God can never be saved by the devil.'

The Rev. William Wakinshaw has published a volume of sermons and called it *The Vow of Ruth* (Epworth Press; 4s. net), after the subject of the first sermon. Mr. Wakinshaw is a sincere believer in what he says, and what he believes in he can say simply and persuasively. In his sincerity and simplicity lies the success of his preaching and the charm of his book. The sermon on Naaman is divided into four parts—the Knowledge of Naaman, the Rage of Naaman, the Obedience of Naaman, the Cleansing of Naaman. Commonplace? The sermon is not commonplace.

Why not Islam? is Dr. Frank Ballard's title for a sketch of Muhammadanism which is fair and reliable and at the same time reveals its terrible and insistent menace to civilization (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net).

The Case against Spiritualism is temperately but firmly put by Miss Jane T. Stoddart (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). What is the Case? Three F's—fraud, folly, futility. Miss Stoddart does not alliterate, but that is what it comes to. Yet there is consideration shown, consideration for ignorance, especially ignorance of Christ, and for that sense of loss which hurriedly grasps at anything with a promise of relief in it. There is not the least hope that this able and temperate book will recover any spiritualist from the error of his ways, for to become a spiritualist one has to surrender the faculty of discernment, but it will save some from falling into the slough.

The Scottish pulpit, which is the best pulpit in the world, is at present strong in intellect but weak in emotion. Now emotion is more than intellect. For the end is persuasion, the movement of the will. And a touch of genuine emotion will move the will which is unaffected by the most interesting information. Professor W. M. Clow of Glasgow has made this discovery. In *The Idylls of Bethany* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net) he has published a volume of sermons which are emotional both in topic and in treatment. It is a pleasure to read them. They are accurate in knowledge, clear in argument, and even arrestive in the novelty of their interpretation. But the secret of their charm lies in the simplicity and directness of their appeal to the emotions. They will undoubtedly persuade men to 'embrace Jesus Christ as he is freely offered to us in the gospels.'

Professor Moffatt has prepared *A Book of Biblical Devotions for Members of the Scottish Church*, and Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have issued it in a comely and convenient shape at 6s. net. Chiefly its contents are selections from Scripture, first from the Psalter (145 pages), then from all parts, under divisions with headings—the Promises of God to Man; Commands of God; Reassurances, Reproaches, and Reproofs of God, Promises of Man to God, Prayers of Man, Thanksgivings of Man. Appeals and Encouragements of Man to Man. The volume ends with Private Devotions taken from the Scots Metrical Psalter, the Scottish Catechism of 1552, the Palatine Catechism of 1591, and a few other sources. It is all right well done.

The day of the long-faced mission book is ended. We have had one after another recently, and each one more lively than the other. The liveliest of all, quite the most entertaining, is the Rev. J. H. Morrison's *Streams in the Desert* (Hodder & Stoughton; 4s. net).

It is the record of a visit to certain of the Mission Stations in Africa supported by the United Free Church of Scotland, especially those belonging to the Livingstonia Mission. Mr. Morrison was sent by the Church as a Deputy to visit these

stations. And he fulfilled his task. If there is lightness in the book it is not that he took his duties lightly. He had the Christ side, which is the bright side of life, turned toward him; and that was well, for the missions as for him. But he realized the dark side vividly enough, and enables us to realize it. The interest of the book lies just in the fact that he enables us to realize, to realize everything.

The Rev. Thomas Wilson, B.D., Stow, was the Hastie Lecturer in Glasgow for 1915 to 1917. He took as the subject of lectures the Fundamentals of the Christian Faith, so that the title of the book, *The Permanence of Christianity* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), is not strictly appropriate. Mr. Wilson touches popularly on the prevalent objections to religion in our day. He admits the reason of some of them, the plausibility of others. He does not attempt to defend the Faith as it has been held and preached. He makes selection of the Fundamentals and is content to show that they are more reasonable and more plausible and more true than all the objections that are urged against them.

The Rev. H. J. Wotherspoon, M.A., D.D., and the Rev. J. M. Kirkpatrick, B.D., the authors of *A Manual of Church Doctrine* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), are identified with that party in the Church of Scotland which in the Church of England would be called High. Their Manual is an exposition, from that point of view, of the Westminster standards. But if this is the High Church where will the Low Church be found?

They claim apostolic succession? Certainly. Who does not? Their claim to apostolic succession for the Church of Scotland is a higher claim, it is the claim to a higher succession, than that which is made by Bishop Gore. Bishop Gore 'supposes that the nature of a Divine Ordinance can be altered by canon—which is an unsafe position. It is the position, *e.g.*, of the Bull of Leo XIII., which rejected the Orders of the Church of England on the ground of the absence from the Anglican Ordinal of the *Traditio Instrumentorum*. The powers of an order of the Ministry, divinely instituted, are inherent in the order. The Church ministerially confers the order, and therewith all that the Lord has included in the commission of that order. Exercise may be restrained by canon, but power is not thereby taken away, and the necessity of circumstance may supersede canon. In the Scotland of the sixteenth century the existing "arrangement in the ministry" had collapsed by the abdication or by the impossibility of the persons representing it, and the restraints which custom and regulation had laid on the fundamental ministry of the presbyterate might very well seem to be in suspense. In falling back upon the inherent and institutional capacities of that ministry for government and for propagation of orders, the *principle* of succession was not violated. That which Presbyters had received *of the Lord* they delivered to us.'

It will take a good writer to interest the average man in Philo. But Professor H. A. A. Kennedy will do it. His book on *Philo's Contribution to Religion* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net) is written with a clear command of the subject, most difficult as it is, and with vigour. Dr. Kennedy even persuades us that Philo is a necessary discipline for the student of the New Testament. Thus: Philo's account of the faith of Abraham, 'although expressed in different terminology, is in remarkable agreement with Paul's interpretation of the same story, that Abraham staked everything on his conviction of the grace and truth and power of God (Rom. iv. 16 ff.; Gal. iii. 7 ff., 18). In both cases there is far more than the mere unfaltering expectation of good things to come. The very foundation of religion is implied in this relation of absolute trust in the unseen God. The same may be said of the writer to the Hebrews, who stands in line with Philo at so many points. For him faith is "the assurance of the things hoped for, the proof (or, conviction) of the things not seen" (xi. 1). It means the realisation in this present of that invisible realm in which God can be fully known, or rather, the realisation of the unseen God himself. "For Moses . . . endured as seeing him who is invisible" (xi. 27). The assurance of God is primary for the writer to the Hebrews as for Philo. All fulfilment of hopes and expectations is for both bound up with that. Indeed, the New Testament teacher uses language which might have been Philo's own, when he declares: "He that draws near to God must believe that he exists, and that he rewards those who earnestly seek him" (xi. 6). This conviction transforms life from illusion into reality.'

There are some fine appetizing items in the new *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester* (Longmans; 2s.). The first item of all is even startling. It is the record of a discovery, made by Dr. Rendel Harris and announced in his inimitable manner, the discovery of passages from the Greek tragedians in the Third Book of Maccabees. Next in timeliness is Dr. Rivers on Mind and Medicine—the wonder of hypnosis and the power of suggestion—something to make the spiritualist think again. Then Dr. Mingana on the theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia — an insight into the distance which separated the fourth century from the first. There are other long articles and there are some short articles, among the latter a note by Mr. G. Vine on the origin of the name Sinn Fein. The phrase means 'Ourselves Alone.' Mr. Vine believes it has come from the Vulgate. 'There is a verse in Ezra, chap. iv. 3 (in the Vulgate, 1 Esdras iv. 3), the latter part of which may have been responsible for its currency: "Sed nos ipsi soli aedificabimus Domino Deo nostro," is rendered in the Douay Old Testament of 1609–10, "But we ourselves alone will build to the Lord our God." This verse, specially appropriate for ecclesiastical purposes such as the dedication of churches, may easily have been responsible for the introduction of the phrase into the religious diction of Ireland, and thence into the common speech of the country. When William Bedell prepared his translation of the Bible in Irish (1685), he translated the words "Nos ipsi soli" by *sinn fein*.'

The Rev. Lucius Waterman, D.D., Rector of S. Thomas's Church, Hanover, New Hampshire, has studied *The Primitive Tradition of the Eucharistic Body and Blood* (Longmans; 9s. net), and has come to the conclusion that every Church has been and is now wrong, altogether wrong, regarding it. That is to say, Dr. Waterman shows that the Roman Catholics, the Zwinglians, and the Calvinists (under which name he seems to include both Anglicans and Presbyterians) have a different conception of the meaning of the words 'This is my body' from that which prevailed in the Early Church, and the Early Church being right, they are all wrong.

Zwinglians say that sacraments are symbols, parables, pictures. 'This is my body' means 'this is a figure of my body.' Romans say that the consecrated elements 'are so entirely taken up into the realm of the supernatural that there remains no natural substance. The bread is changed into the glorified body of our Lord, and the wine—into what? If I understand the Roman theology, I suppose that it must be said that the wine is changed into our Lord's body, too. At any rate, the consecrated elements are so changed into a greater and heavenly thing that nothing of the substance of bread or wine remains, but only appearances deprived of the reality which formerly underlay them.' The Calvinists say that though the elements are 'mere symbols in themselves,' yet they are 'our Lord's body and blood in force and efficacy.'

Now the last, which looks the best, is the worst of all. For it makes a 'distinction between the consecrated bread and wine of the Eucharist, on the one hand, and the body and blood of our Lord! Why, the idea would have been to all the early writers of the Church repulsive and unintelligible. . . . They could distinguish between our Lord's body in the Eucharist and our Lord's body in heaven. They could never have distinguished between the consecrated bread and our Lord's body in the Eucharist.'

The readers of Louisa M. Alcott's books must read *Louisa May Alcott, Dreamer and Worker*, by Belle Moses, just issued in a new and cheap edition (Sampson Low; 4s. 6d. net). It is as well written (or nearly) as *Little Women* itself and just as free from preachiness. It is the true story of the lives of those little women.

Six men of the Free Churches of England have together written a book on Unity. *Pathways to Christian Unity* they call it (Macmillan; 6s. net). Their names are Arthur Black, G. E. Darlaston, W. E. Orchard, William Paton, J. H. Squire, and Malcolm Spencer. They are writers, gifted with style. They are preachers, burdened with a message. They are disciples of Christ, sensible of the disservice that is done to Him when His Body the Church is rent. There are those even yet who have little interest in reunion, but they will read this most readable book. Those who have an interest will devour it.

One thing above all others moves these men to work for unity. It is that into the Church there may again be brought the regenerate power of the gospel.

To his own question, *Is the World Growing Better?* (Macmillan; $1.60), Dr. James H. Snowden's answer is affirmative and emphatic. He interprets the signs of the times in terms of Christ and Christianity. He sees and he foresees. And he does not demand the impossible or the undesirable. There is union and there is unity. For example: 'In the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York are seven chapels arranged around the apse in each one of which worship is conducted in a different language. It would not conduce to the intelligibility and order of the service to remove these partitions and merge the polyglot congregations in one; and yet they are all gathered under one roof and are integral parts of the same grand cathedral; and they worship the same Lord and Christ. So may our denominations be viewed as chapels in which we worship in a somewhat different tongue or accent. No doubt there are too many partitions; some of them have been torn down; others of them are growing thin and seem about to crumble. But no doubt many of them will long endure, at least in the interest of geographical and national boundaries and of spiritual order and harmony and efficiency. Denominations have their dangers, but we would abolish them probably at the risk and cost of greater dangers. Different outer organizations, however, need not hinder the inner spiritual unity for which Christ prayed and which should bind all Christians into fellowship.'

An intelligible history of modern science in its evolution will be welcomed by the unscientific seeker after knowledge. It has been written by Mr. John Mills. The title which Mr. Mills has given to his book is *The Realities of Modern Science* (Macmillan; $2.50 net). That is the title of one of its chapters. For the 'realities' of modern science are matter and energy. Now, however, the word matter is usually displaced by the word electricity. And in the book it is electricity and energy that Mr. Mills treats of.

An interesting section describes the discovery of wireless telegraphy. It is a fine instance of the value of co-operation—even of international co-operation, for Maxwell was a Scotsman, Hertz a German, and Marconi an Italian. 'In 1873 Maxwell, who was a prominent physicist, highly trained in the use of mathematical tools, announced that light was an electrical phenomenon and travelled as an electromagnetic wave. He further stated the possibility of there being other electromagnetic waves which would not produce the effect of light but would travel just as high waves travel. In 1887 Hertz verified this prophecy of Maxwell, and announced the discovery of electromagnetic waves. Hertz studied their properties or characteristics. He showed how they could be produced, how they travelled through the walls of buildings and were not affected by obstacles which would completely obstruct the passage of light, and also how they could be detected, since they do not affect the eyes as does light. In 1896 Marconi showed how these waves could be utilized for telegraphy, by inventing an antenna from which they might start out and by which they might be received.'

Mr. Mills further shows how these men had gifts differing one from another, and how the difference seemed to be essential for success: 'We notice that all three types were necessary for the complete development. Sometimes the mental qualifications are combined in one man, but in most cases a man's best ability lies along only one of these lines. If we see the importance in the progress of science of each type, we may appraise more accurately their contributions and thus avoid the popular error of attaching too much credit to the inventor or the converse academic error of failing to give him sufficient credit.'

Messrs. Marshall Brothers have issued another edition of *Prophecy, the War, and the Near East* (4s. net), by the Rev. G. Harold Lancaster, perhaps the most popular of all the 'prophetic' books which the War has given us.

In *Old Bible Characters* (Morgan & Scott; 4s. 6d. net), Mr. George E. Morgan, M.A., describes the character of the greater men and women in the Book of Genesis. He accepts the narrative throughout on its face value, having no critical qualms whatever. But he is very modern in his language. His purpose is to make these men and women live and move and have their being in our very midst. It is not Hebrew antiquities that he calls upon for understanding, it is human nature.

There is a great appetite in the world for essays. They have to be one thing, however, and

not another. They have to be short, ethical, and anecdotal. The essay of the right kind is to be found in Mr. Arthur Porritt's *The Strategy of Life* (Morgan & Scott; 4s. 6d. net). The subjects are as old as Abraham—Character, Religion in Action, Chivalry, Open-mindedness, Money, and many more that are like. But they are also quite new. For every generation of young people has to have these ideals held up before it and every individual boy has to be encouraged to receive them into his heart and practise them in his life.

Notice one thing — adaptation. Dr. Jowett writes an introduction and says, 'I once wrote to Henry Drummond inviting him to speak to my congregation in Newcastle-on-Tyne. He very graciously declined, and he did so for this very characteristic reason: "I do not know the species." Drummond knew University men, he knew them through and through; he professed he had no intimacy with the mixed congregation.' Mr. Porritt knows the species called Boy.

Have you seen this parallel before?

"Two men shall be in a field, one is taken and one left."

"What man of you having a hundred sheep, and having lost one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine and go after that which is lost?"

"The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a grain of mustard seed which a man took and sowed in his field."

"The Kingdom of Heaven is as a man travelling into a far country who called his servants and delivered unto them his goods."

"There were many lepers in the time of Elisha, and none of them was cleansed but Naaman. . . ."

"The men of Nineveh shall stand up in judgment with this generation and shall condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, a greater than Jonah is here."

"Two women shall be grinding at the mill, one is taken, and one is left."

"What woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece doth not light a lamp and sweep the house and seek diligently until she find it?"

"The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal."

"Then shall the Kingdom of Heaven be likened to ten virgins who took their lamps and went forth to meet the bridegroom."

"There were many widows in Israel in the time of Elijah, and unto none of them was he sent but to Zarephath."

"The Queen of the South shall rise up in judgment with the men of this generation and shall condemn them; for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold a greater than Solomon is here."

Miss Edith Picton-Turbervill, O.B.E., presents that parallel in her book on *Christ and Woman's Power* (Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net). In that volume she quotes Russel Wallace: 'In the not distant future the place of woman will be far higher and more important than any which has been claimed for her or by her in the past. The woman of the future will be the regenerator of the human race.'

Messrs. Nelson have republished in their 'Edinburgh Library of Non-Fiction Books,' Mr. G. M. Trevelyan's volume on *The Recreations of an Historian* (2s. 6d. net). The book was first published six years ago by Messrs. Longmans under the title of *Clio, a Muse.* Four new essays have been added to that edition, one on 'The Two Carlyles,' one on 'Englishmen and Italians,' one on 'The News of Ramillies,' and one on 'The Hegira of Rousseau.' In 'The Two Carlyles' Mr. Trevelyan pleads for forgetfulness of the political Carlyle, and for remembrance of the literary Carlyle. It was the study of Cromwell that changed the liberty-lover into the hero-worshipper of power. 'The figure of Cromwell was to Carlyle a great opportunity and a great temptation. He rose to the opportunity and he yielded to the temptation. Carlyle did much good to Cromwell, but Cromwell did much harm to Carlyle.'

Fellowship is a word of power—never more than now. It is of Fellowship the Rev. Edward S. G. Wickham writes in *Gospel Comradeship* (Nisbet; 2s. net). It is of Fellowship as the desire of the human heart, the purpose of God in Christ, the fulfilling of the Cross of Calvary. It is no ordinary book. The author has lavishly spent upon it the thought and experience of a lifetime.

Are Prayer Meetings a Failure? The answer is in the negative. See Mr. J. T. Budd's small book with that title (Scott; 1s. net).

The Bishop of Edinburgh has found that his exposition of the Apocalypse has been helpful to the readers of that difficult book and he has published another volume. This volume, which interprets chapters xix. to xxii., he calls *Visions and Judgments* (Scott; 3s. 6d. net). It is a surprise to see how intelligible and edifying the Apocalypse

becomes in the hands of a devout scholar. There is no straining after the unreachable. Where mystery abides it is the mystery of the God we know and love. After the final judgment comes 'the second death, even the lake of fire'—what is that?

Says Dr. Walpole, 'There is no hint anywhere as to what that means. The second death, like the first, might mean unconsciousness; the lake of fire might mean purification, for fire does not annihilate but only changes. Both words represent some effect on the personality, and no words can picture the horror this involves. That it may mean destruction or annihilation is suggested by the words, "Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire," which can but mean, "were brought to nothing and were never known again." But here we willingly remain ignorant, and the one satisfaction is that whatever the words express, they are the decision of One Who in judgment never ceases to be Love. If the sentence of death, when passed on some abandoned criminal, moves us in spite of his hardness to deep compassion, we know that feeling is of God. No human creature can surpass the Creator in love and mercy. But few men have wept over the coming judgment of an enemy, but He Who sits on the Great White Throne did. It is still rarer to find anywhere a man who had in his intense sympathy taken the criminal's place and suffered his sentence, but He Who sits on the Great White Throne did. We can therefore safely leave "*the lake of fire*" and "*the second death*" in His hands, being absolutely confident that the best for the judged, as well as the best for Humanity, will be done. "His mercy is over all His works," and is everlasting.'

At last we have for English readers a satisfactory edition of the writings of *Buchanan the Sacred Bard of the Scottish Highlands* (Simpkin; 5s. net). The editor is Mr. Lachlan Macbean.

'Among the great poets of the Scottish Gael three are acknowledged to be of outstanding ability—Alexander Macdonald, 1700–1770; Dugald Buchanan, 1716–1768, and Duncan Macintyre, 1724–1812, and it is interesting to note that these three were contemporaries. It would almost seem that at this time (as happened in Athens in the days of Aeschylus, Euripides, and Sophocles), the poetic genius of the race attained its full growth and flowered in these three notable men. Of the three, Buchanan alone chose for his special sphere of work the sublime themes of the spiritual realm, and well he was equipped for the task.'

Buchanan's poetry is in Gaelic. The rest of his writing is in English. For he was educated partly in Edinburgh. The poetry has had several translators, of whom Professor J. S. Blackie was one. His translation of two verses of 'The Skull,' Buchanan's best known poem, may be compared with that of the editor of this volume. Take the first and sixth verses:

Blackie.	Macbean.
I sat all alone By a cold grey stone, And behold, a skull lay on the ground! I took in my hand, And pitiful scanned Its ruin, all round and round.	At the burial mound, As I sat on the ground, A shapeless grey skull I espied; I raised it and scanned Its form in my hand, And turning it over I sighed.
From that blank look of thine I gather no sign Of that life-tale, its shame or its glory; Proud Philip's great son And his slave are as one, When a skull is the sum of their story.	Thy face shows not now Whose cranium wert thou, If king or if noble rich; Alexander the Great Is in the same state As a slave that has died in a ditch.

These 'Spiritual Songs' of Buchanan were the outcome of a remarkable spiritual experience, much like Bunyan's, the story of which Buchanan told in the form of a diary. In the winter before his death, Buchanan met David Hume in Edinburgh. 'In course of conversation Hume expressed the opinion that the sublimest passage in all literature is Shakespeare's description in *The Tempest*, Act. iv. Sc. 1, beginning "The cloud capped towers," etc., but Buchanan immediately quoted words still more impressive from the Revelation of St. John xx. 11–13, "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God."'

The new number of the 'Texts for Students' is a reproduction with notes and two photographs of the most important *Christian Inscriptions* anterior to the Edict of Toleration of 312. The author is Mr. H. P. V. Nunn, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net).

The S.P.C.K. 'Helps for Students of History' now include *Hints on the Study of Latin* (8d. net), by Professor Alexander Souter; *Hints on Transla-*

tion from Latin into English (6d. net), by the same; and *The Wanderings and Homes of Manuscripts* (3s. net), by Dr. M. R. James.

The Rev. Henry Holloway, M.A., B.D., has written a history of *The Reformation in Ireland* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). How Irish it is! We do not mean Mr. Holloway's history, but the Reformation. How is its utter failure to be accounted for? Mr. Holloway can scarcely see it, for he is a loyal son of his Church, but there is no doubt that the chief cause was ecclesiastical high-handedness. Mr. Holloway does admit that, 'whatever may be the intrinsic merits of the Reformation, the presenting of it in Ireland was grossly mismanaged.' But he lays the chief blame on the remoteness of the Pale in Elizabeth's time and the consequent ease with which the Roman priests could evade the law, whereas the cause of causes was just the opposite. Instead of being left alone the priests were harried and driven, and the more they were persecuted the more tenaciously did the people cling to them and to what they stood for.

Mr. Holloway's history will be widely read and it will repay its readers. He is particularly strong on the Acts that were passed for the ordering of religion in Ireland.

You may not get much out of the poets or modern prophets on behalf of organized Christianity. But on behalf of Christ you may go to any poet or prophet you please—to Dante, to Browning, to Tennyson, to Thompson, even to Shelley and to Blake among the poets, or to Savonarola, Mazzini, or Ruskin among the prophets—and you get almost all that your heart can desire. The Rev. Richard Roberts has gone to the poets and prophets named and has written a most pleasantly readable book on *The Jesus of Poets and Prophets* (S.C.M.; 4s. 6d. net).

Mr. Walter A. Parkyn is resolved that there shall be war *Never Again!* and writes a strong whole-hearted condemnation of it under that title (Swarthmore Press).

Life's Adventure is the title of the Adult School Lesson Handbook for 1920 (Swarthmore Press; 2s. 6d. net). Life's adventure is the search for Truth, Beauty, and Goodness. The search is sustained through more than two hundred fascinating pages, every page being filled to the full with fine-tempered thought and literary reference. There is, as usual, a lesson for every week in the year.

Mr. Dudley Wright offers a fairly full and apparently reliable, though quite popular, account of *The Eleusinian Mysteries and Rites*, in his book with that title published by the Theosophical Publishing House (5s.). He has been attracted to the study because of the affinity between the mysteries and freemasonry. And that same affinity is clearly the attraction for the Rev. J. Fort Newton, D.Litt., D.D., formerly minister of the City Temple, who writes an introduction. Mr. Wright gives a long list of literature at the end of his book, but he has missed the latest and the best. We have nothing to compare with Professor Percy Gardner's article in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS.

'On all sides we are hearing of telepathy, telergy, clairvoyance, clairaudience, psychometry, mesmerism, hypnotism, suggestion and auto-suggestion, automatic writing, trance-phenomena, mediumship of every variety, multiple personality, exteriorization of sensibility, psychical materialization, communication with the departed, visions and rapts, dream-psychology, the psychology of the abnormal, with all its manifold complexities and well-nigh inexhaustible data, psycho-analysis, psychical research, psycho-therapeutics, mental and spiritual healing of every kind, and so on and so forth.' And now let us hear of the subtle body.

Mr. G. R. S. Mead, the editor of *The Quest*, is a theosophist; so we are not surprised to receive from him a book on *The Doctrine of the Subtle Body in Western Tradition* (Watkins; 6s. net). But he is not for the moment intent on instructing us in theosophy. He is a historian. He has found that in early philosophical thought the body was regarded in at least four different aspects, and his desire is to make these aspects known. There is the Physical Body, the Spirit Body, the Radiant Body, and the Resurrection Body. The physical body we know something about, it is of the other three, which taken together make the subtle body, that Mr. Mead tells us.

The spirit body is the body which the spirit uses, as the physical body is the body which the soul

uses. But the spirit body is not Paul's spiritual body. That is the resurrection body. Higher than the spirit (or spirituous) body, but not so high as the spiritual or resurrection body, is the radiant body, called also the celestial or luciform body, or organon of light, the *augoeides* or *astroeides* of the Platonists. The resurrection body is the most exalted vehicle soul or spirit uses. The Jews regarded it sometimes as material, sometimes as spiritual. The early Christians took over the common material view, but Paul saw that the body of Jesus was of a spiritual nature and was to be the firstfruits of a great harvest from the dead. Mr. Mead hopes that modern Christians will follow Paul and see in the resurrection of Jesus, not a rising to life of the physical body laid in the tomb, but a manifestation of a far more glorious body, fit instrument for a divine and human spirit.

Christ and the Affections.

By the Right Reverend G. H. S. Walpole, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh.

'What shall I do to inherit eternal life?' Again and again the question has been asked, as it was at first, in the hope that some great deed, a renunciation or sacrifice, or perhaps some series of deeds involving lifelong mortification, would secure the great prize. But such questioners generally regard the life they would obtain as being some happy circumstances or ideal conditions, a Paradise or a heaven.

But life is larger than that with which they would identify it. Life is vitality, the glow of fine feeling aroused by some exciting cause, such as a picture, a concert, a drama, a declaration of love. And eternal life is this fine, living, full, intelligent emotion without change, the spiritual thermometer never falling below temperate. It knows neither moods nor periods of depression, but ever goes forward on its topmost note.

Now though men have not always identified eternal life with high thought and warm feeling, they have always desired it, pressed forward for it, longed to obtain it. How, then, may we have it? How does Christ answer the question: 'What is written in the law—How readest thou?' The reply seems chilling.

But the questioner was a lawyer, and was therefore naturally reminded that the answer lay in the path of his daily duty. The law of Moses was his special and particular duty, and there he would find what he wanted to know. A moment's thought gave him the right answer. Life lay in love. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself.' That was the law, and our Lord quietly emphasized it by saying, 'This do, and thou shalt live.' Necessarily so, for love and life are one thing, or neither is anything. To love is to live. Do we not find it so? I come in tired and dull, the book I love lies on the table, in less than an hour I live. I am depressed and moody, the friend I love meets me, and in a moment the cloud of depression has gone, I live. Everything seems flat and unprofitable, but I turn into the concert hall to hear the music I love, it catches me, and I am soon alive. We need not labour it further—to love is to live. And, of course, it naturally follows that the higher the object of love the finer and fuller the life. The wise, well-informed, noble-minded friend, necessarily responds in fuller measure than one less highly gifted. He gives us fuller life. And as the very highest object of all is, of course, God, to love God must mean the fullest life. It may be more difficult to love Him because we do not see Him, and because filling all space He seems too incomprehensible for us to gain a clear conception of Him, but if love is possible the very fullest life is certain. Now before the revelation of the Incarnation the difficulty of really knowing God was evidently felt, for in the Old Testament there are but few burning love passages, nothing comparable with what we find afterwards. Now and again we hear some affectionate soul crying out:

> Whom have I in heaven but Thee?
> And there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison with Thee;

or, My soul hangeth upon Thee.
Thy right hand hath upholden me;

or, Thy law is dearer unto me than thousands of gold and silver;

or, My soul waiteth only upon God: from Him cometh my salvation: He only is my rock and my salvation: He is my high tower, I shall not be greatly moved;

or, The Lord is my Shepherd, therefore I can lack nothing.

But such expressions are not common. And we are not surprised. For not only had the Jew no figure by which he could picture God to his mind, but he was not allowed to imagine one. God therefore seemed far removed, and when Christ came even the pronunciation of His sacred name was lost, for it was named but once a year, and that only by the High Priest, and the secret seems to have disappeared. And so it was that whilst the command was clear that God was to be loved with all the affections, there was but little to stir them. Religious art was unknown, music was in a very primitive state, and sermons by which men have been moved to love God were but seldom heard. His Righteousness would be admired, His Wisdom praised, His Holiness revered, but His womanly tenderness was but rarely spoken of. Now and again prophets like Hosea, Isaiah, or The Unknown, would dare by the power of the Spirit to attribute his own strange emotion to God, but it was very occasional.

When we compare what the Old Testament gives us with the glowing passages of the New, with the warm, passionate expressions of devotion of Apostolic Fathers like Ignatius, the fervent, affectionate prayers and confessions of saints like Augustine, and the love verses of Christian hymns, we feel that some great change in the conception of God must have taken place. In some way He who was far off had been brought near, and He who was unimaginable by the poor and ignorant had been seen: One who to most was but Judge and Ruler was now Father. And we know how it was: the Incarnation had taken place: God was seen in Jesus Christ, the Father was revealed in the Son, the Judge was seen dying for the guilty. And this change was followed by natural consequences. Art, imprisoned by the Second Commandment, began to break its bonds; music took wings; eloquence found a new subject, preachers rivalling the greatest orators of the past; simple, uneducated men and women found their feelings too strong for words and spake with new tongues. The whole world of emotion was enlarged. Jesus became the living, warm centre from which radiated in every direction currents charged with a new power that fired men's hearts. Even the comparatively few letters that come down to us from the years immediately succeeding the Ascension of Christ, didactic and dogmatic as in the main they are, leave the even tenor of their reasoned path with outbursts of affection, as when S. Paul, writing to the Galatians, cries out, 'I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me.' Or, when later reminding the Christians at Rome of the blessings of Justification, he combats the idea that any one can punish them. 'When God acquits, who shall condemn? Will Christ? the Christ who died, yet who rose from the dead? The Christ who is at God's right hand, who actually pleads for us? What can ever part us from Christ's love? Can anguish, or calamity, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or danger, or the sword? Because as it is written: For thy sake we are being killed all the day long, we are counted as sheep to be slaughtered. No, in all this we are more than conquerors through Him who loved us. For I am certain, neither death nor life, neither angels nor principalities, neither the present nor the future, no powers of the Height or of the Depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to part us from God's love in Christ Jesus our Lord.'[1]

And S. Peter, in his brief letter, appeals to a common experience of the believers in his day when he writes, 'Now you who believe, you hold Him precious; for though you never knew Him, you love Him, and though for the moment you do not see Him, yet you believe in Him, and will thrill with an unspeakable and glorious joy when you obtain the outcome of your faith in the salvation of your soul.'[2]

So, too, S. John begins his great prophetic book the Apocalypse with an ascription of praise to Him 'that loveth us and loosed us from our sins by His blood.'

And in the days immediately succeeding, Christians find no language too extravagant to express the warmth of their affection to Christ. So S.

[1] Ro 8^{33-39}. Dr. Moffatt's translation.

[2] 1 P $1^{8.9}$.

Ignatius, as he looks forward to his martyrdom cries out: 'The joys of this world shall benefit me no more, nor the kingdoms of this age. I would rather die unto Christ Jesus than reign over the ends of the earth. I seek Him who died on our behalf, I want Him who rose again for us: the pangs of birth are laid upon me.' Or again, 'Living I write to you, but it is as loving to die. For my love has been crucified and there is left in me no spark of earthly love at all, but only a spring of living water which speaks in me with an inward voice, saying, "Hence and away to the Father." I desire no more the food of corruption, nor the delights of this life. I want the bread of God, which is the flesh of Christ; and His blood it is that I want to drink, the blood which is immortal love.' And such burning thoughts, though not so eloquently expressed, were not uncommon in the dangerous days of Roman persecutions.

And as men found in art and music vehicles for fuller expression of their affections, so poetry, which has always been love's best helpmeet, was freely used. And contrary to expectation this has not been confined to men of leisure who, possessing a dreamy, imaginative temperament, have loved to put into metre fanciful descriptions of Christ, but has been expressed by men of affairs and strong character. There is Francis Xavier, whose love of Christ led him to turn his back on the University of Paris and his admiring circle of disciples for the labours and perils of the East Indies, where he died at the comparatively early age of fifty-six, who shows us the source of his courage and self-sacrifice in the words we know so well:

> My God, I love Thee not because
> I hope for heaven thereby,
> Nor yet because who love Thee not
> Are lost eternally,
> Nor with the hope of gaining aught,
> Nor seeking a reward,
> But as Thyself hast loved me,
> O ever loving Lord.

And there is John Newton, the daring slave trader, who when he finds his real Master, through a chance reading of *The Imitation*, feels he cannot say all that he would wish in expressing his love:

> How sweet the Name of Jesus sounds
> In a believer's ear!
> It soothes his sorrows, heals his wounds,
> And drives away his fear.
> Weak is the effort of my heart,
> Cold is my warmest thought;
> But, when I see Thee as Thou art,
> I'll praise Thee as I ought.

These strong, busy, active, and, during much of their life, silent men are those who, with many others, have through their hymns inspired the Church of Christ; their lives bearing testimony to the reality of their glowing words, thus showing that intense personal affection to Christ is not chilled by lives of daring and enterprise nor stifled by overmuch business. On the contrary, it is the life that makes all things live.

So, too, it has been found that in the great religious awakenings that have from time to time shaken the world, their strength has lain in a personal devotion to Christ that loved to find a refuge in words. We shall never know what the Wesleyan revival of the eighteenth century owed to such hymns as

> Jesu, Lover of my soul,
> Let me to Thy bosom fly,
> While the gathering waters roll,
> While the tempest still is high:
> Hide me, O my Saviour, hide,
> Till the storm of life be past;
> Safe into the haven guide,
> O receive my soul at last!

nor what the Oxford movement would have been without a Keble and a Newman to keep it warm and high by such spiritual songs as

> Sun of my soul, Thou Saviour dear!
> It is not night if Thou be near:
> O may no earth-born cloud arise
> To hide Thee from Thy servant's eyes.

As the strength of the call to patriotism may be measured by the music and songs it produces, so the power of a call to God will be evidenced by the oratorios and hymns in which it finds expression. Judged by this standard, our religious life to-day may well give cause for serious questioning. We use again and again the old hymns because they are more direct, more personal, and more simple than those produced in our own time. Earnest and spiritually effective as the Moody and Sankey revivals were, they gave us nothing that has enriched our Hymnal, and bold and venturesome as our missionary enterprises have been, we still find our emotions better expressed in such hymns as that of Isaac Watts:

> Jesus shall reign where'er the sun,

or that of John Marriott:

> O Thou, whose almighty word.

The scientific and critical spirit of the age which has permeated all classes seems to have made men so cautious about the nature and person of Christ that they dare not confess a half of what they feel. They prefer the well-known paraphrases of such Psalms as the twenty-third, or the ninetieth, or the hundredth, to the definitely Christian hymns, because in them they do not commit themselves too far and they feel safer. Everywhere is needed an evangelical revival which shall give back to the mass of professing Christians their old heritage, the known and felt companionship of Christ. That once gained, there will be a return to the old fervour, and men will find their present attitude too straitened, their surrounding atmosphere too depressed, and their climate too chill. Through the power of the Spirit of Jesus, known and felt, they will seek for new expressions of devotion and affection, new avenues for their overfull emotions, and will again claim poetry and music as aids to help them in interpreting those strange thoughts that have come to them of all that Christ Jesus means to them.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'A good man leaveth an inheritance.'—Pr 12^{22}.

A long time ago—it was the 6th of March 1474—there was joy in a home at Caprese in Italy because a little son had been born.

The father was not a wealthy man, but he belonged to a noble Italian family and was very proud. He had high ambitions for the future of his boy. One of these was that he should grow up to be a member of one of the learned professions. The baby was given a very grand name—Michael Angelo, after the Archangel Michael. His surname was a well-known and honoured Italian name. Like many other babies of the same class, little Michael was sent away up to the hill country to be nursed. His foster-mother was a stone-cutter's wife, and naturally he learned to love her. Long afterwards when Michael Angelo had become a great man, he used to say that he had got his sharp tongue from the hills and his love for the mallet and chisel from the stone-cutter's home.

He came back from his foster-mother's care, a child who seemed to have no desire to play or even to learn; he kept constantly wanting to handle a pencil and to draw all sorts of weird pictures. After a bit, his childish drawings were to be seen upstairs, downstairs, everywhere over the walls of the house. His father tried to induce him to take an interest in other and more natural amusements but failed. Then he whipped the boy; but Michael's love of drawing was a gift from God, nothing could kill it out. For a time his father was a very disappointed man indeed. To his mind Michael as an artist was a thought unworthy of the name he bore.

Michael had a companion named Francesco, who also loved Art. He had gone to study with a famous master, and used to bring his drawings to show them to Michael. What talks they had together then! Many things helped to make what in Michael seemed mere stubbornness into strength, and the proud spirit of the father was at last conquered; he reluctantly agreed to send his boy to be a pupil at the same studio as Francesco went to in Florence.

Michael, however, was not received exactly as a pupil. Ghirlandajo, the master, was a wise man and recognized his worth. He agreed to pay Michael a small but gradually rising salary for the first three years. If Ghirlandajo was a great artist, he was also a humble man. Yet it was but natural that he should feel irritated, when a pupil with such a sense of his own ability as Michael had, dared occasionally to do clever things that hurt. There came a day, however, when he could not help saying, 'This youth already knows more of art than I do myself.'

Michael Angelo grew up to be more than merely an artist. In those days, even boys and girls could not live in Italy without coming to know that nearly all the educated people thought about religion. They did not think of it as you boys and girls are taught to do. They cared for their souls—they believed in being pure in heart—but they counted knowledge the greatest thing in the

world. Now, even the youngest boy or girl here could tell me that there is a greater thing, and that is love. Michael Angelo made many notable friends among those who loved learning, and sought after truth. One was a distinguished member of a very wonderful Italian family. His name was Lorenzo, and Lorenzo loved art as well as books. He had collected in a garden a great many fine specimens of Greek and Roman sculpture, and students were allowed in to copy from his collection, just as they go to picture galleries to copy now. Among those who frequented Lorenzo's garden was our friend Michael. It is told that in copying the head of a Faun he restored it. The mouth of the Faun was almost worn away by the injuries of time, and Michael gave his copy a smile and a complete set of teeth. As Lorenzo walked round among the students he was greatly fascinated by the young sculptor Michael. In a bantering way he said to him, 'How have you given your Faun a complete set of teeth? Don't you know that such old fellows are sure to have lost some of them?' Michael, keen to profit by what was said to him, removed a few of the teeth with his chisel, and formed sockets to appear as if they had dropped out. On Lorenzo's next visit, he was so astonished and delighted that he found not only a higher position for Michael's father than he had formerly held, but a place at his own table for the young sculptor.

But in three years Lorenzo died. His son did not inherit his good qualities, and in course of time Michael left Florence.

He returned, however, in about a year, with his mind full of ideas. More than Lorenzo had begun to recognize his greatness, and commissions were being pressed upon him. One that he executed was a colossal statue of your Old Testament favourite, David. A rough and unshapely block of marble upon which some one else had been working was given to him. Michael Angelo had eyes that saw David with his sling inside it, and he set at work to release him, with the result that Michael Angelo's *David* is known over all the world.

He painted pictures as well as worked in marble. His ambition had been roused in this direction by seeing the wonderful works of older artists than himself—artists who put their thoughts about God into every picture they painted. From the wonderful frescoes that Michael Angelo painted on the roofs and walls of the Sistine Chapel in Rome, one could tell what sort of thoughts generally occupied his mind. There is not a picture among them that does not suggest some Bible story, and the whole atmosphere of the place somehow speaks of Jesus Christ as the Saviour of men.

Michael Angelo, the greatest of Italian artists, was a deeply religious man, and his pictures are of the kind that influence people for good. But in his daily life he was masterful and stern: he would not have been so beloved as he is but for the beautiful story at the end of his life. It is like a tender sunset at the close of a glorious autumn day.

When he was over sixty he learned that *love* was the greatest thing in the world. It was through becoming acquainted with a good and noble lady, the widow of a Marquis. Her whole character makes one think of the 'Good Duchess of Gordon' who lived in Aberdeenshire during part of last century. The Italian lady was a devout Christian, as also was Elizabeth, last Duchess of Gordon. Her friendship with Michael Angelo did a great deal for him, for their talk was always about religion. Doubtless you could often have understood it, for they spoke of the same Jesus who is the friend of boys and girls.

When she died the great artist felt he had lost a friend who had been a great blessing to him. By her beautiful example she had

Pointed to brighter worlds and led the way.

As you think of Michael Angelo's wonderful life, and its beautiful close, does it not drive impure thoughts out of your minds? And does it not somehow turn your thoughts to the highest—to Jesus and His love?

The Ass that could not be Spared.

'Go into the village that is over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her: loose them, and bring them unto me.'—Mt 21^{2}.

This is a verse which has given a great deal of trouble to wise men who study the Bible. And why do you think it has worried them? Because two animals are mentioned in it instead of one! Mark, Luke, and John all tell the same story, but they mention only one beast—the ass's colt. Matthew speaks of two—the ass and the ass's colt.

Now these wise men have brought forward learned reasons why Matthew should differ from the others. But one man[1] had an idea of his own. He went to an old farmer who had a wide knowledge of the ways of animals, and he asked him if there was any reason why the ass should accompany the colt. And the wise old man replied, 'Certainly, an unbroken colt simply would not go at all—could not be *made* to go—unless its mother went along with it. It would be totally unmanageable and useless away from her.'

Christ rode only on a colt, so perhaps the other evangelists did not think it worth while mentioning the mother-ass, but Matthew did not forget her.

You can picture the ass and the colt that day when the disciples went to fetch them. They lived in Bethany, and they belonged to a man who was a friend of Jesus. (Perhaps that friend was Lazarus whom Christ raised from the dead.) Sometimes Jesus came to visit their master, and He never went away without giving a kindly clap to the ass and picking a bunch of nice juicy grass for the colt. And the master used to say, 'If you ever want the use of my ass or her foal be sure to send for them. I'll be delighted to lend them.'

So the day came when Jesus did have need of the colt. It was the day on which He was to ride into Jerusalem as the King of Peace. And He sent two of His disciples to fetch the beasts, with directions where they were to find them and what they were to say to the owner.

When the disciples reached the spot where the animals were tied, they unfastened the ass, and, putting a halter round her neck, led her away. The colt they did not attempt to lead. It went with its mother, trotting and cantering by her side.

But when they reached the highroad where Jesus was waiting a change took place. The halter was taken off the ass, and, insult of insults, was put upon the colt! He who had always run free had a halter placed round his neck! He who had never borne a saddle or carried a burden had garments laid upon him and was obliged to carry a human being! Trembling with fear and rage the colt refused to move, but just then he heard a soft little bray at his ear. It was his mother telling him that it was all right and to go on for she would be beside him. Then the Man on his back gave him a kindly clap and an encouraging word, and he recognized the kind voice of that Friend of his master who used to feed him with bunches of grass. He began to walk slowly down the road, and, as he went, his mother ran beside him encouraging him by her presence. By and by, as he gained confidence she stopped now and again to snatch a bite of grass by the roadside, but always she kept near him.

When the crowds gathered to hail Jesus as the Messiah and to lay branches in his path they pushed and jostled the ass. They thought she was only in the way. But the little trembling colt knew better, and the Lord of life Himself knew better. He could see into the heart of the creature and He knew that it needed its mother's presence.

Now, boys and girls, this story of the ass and the ass's colt teaches us a very beautiful lesson—the lesson that the things which seem unimportant cannot be done without. Christ rode upon the colt, but He needed the ass too. He could not have ridden to Jerusalem at all that day had the ass not come also.

Sometimes we want to do the big, grand things, the things that everybody will talk about, the things that will make a stir in the world. And we forget that if there were nobody to do the little things, the big ones would never be done. It was like that during the Great War, was it not? Our gallant soldiers and sailors and airmen faced the enemy for us; they went through terrible privations and dangers. They did the big, grand things. But they could not have done them had it not been for the people at home doing the little things. They could not have done them had it not been for the men and women who worked in munitions and aeroplane factories and in shipbuilding yards, had it not been for the mothers and wives and sisters and children who stayed at home to roll bandages and knit socks and pray.

I want to tell you of one boy who did his bit just by making coffee. His name was Dan Taylor, but they called him 'little Dan.' He was cabin-boy on board the trawler *Providence* of Brixham in Devon, and there was one thing he excelled in—nobody could make quite such good coffee as he. You shall hear how his gift was put to use.

On New Year's Day, 1915, the *Providence* was

[1] The idea for this sermon was derived from an article by the Rev. Rayner Winterbotham in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May 1917.

out in the English Channel and making for home. A fierce storm was raging and the waves were running twenty feet high. About half-past eleven in the forenoon the third hand sighted a boat in the distance. It was a naval cutter packed with bluejackets and it seemed to be in distress. He reported the matter to the skipper, and the latter, with great difficulty and danger to himself, turned his vessel and went to the rescue of the cutter. The boat proved to contain sixty-eight survivors of H.M.S. *Formidable* which had been torpedoed by the Germans very early that morning.

At great risk to themselves the skipper, the mate, and the third hand managed to rescue the shivering men. Some of them were only half-clad, many were in a state of collapse, all of them were soaked to the skin, and none had had anything to eat or drink since seven o'clock the previous evening.

At first 'little Dan' helped to hold the end of a rope, but soon an idea struck him. He saw how cold and hungry and wet the men looked, and he thought that the very thing they needed was a cup of hot coffee. So he hustled down to the cabin and before a bluejacket was got on board he had the water boiling and a big jug of steaming coffee ready!

And how these men enjoyed it! It seemed to put new life into them and they declared it was the best coffee they had ever tasted. And the more they drank, the more they wanted. So 'little Dan' was kept busy brewing coffee until the *Providence* reached Brixham at eight o'clock in the evening.

You will be glad to hear that none of the bluejackets died, and that the doctors declared that 'little Dan' had helped to save many a life.

'Little Dan' was too small to rescue drowning men, but he was not too small to make coffee. He was too small to do the big thing, but he was not too small to do the little thing, and he did what he could do.

And, boys and girls, isn't 'little Dan's' position very much like yours? You can't go out to business yet and do the difficult work father does, you can't earn money to keep the family, but you *can* make his work lighter for him by being cheerful and obliging. You can't look after the household as mother does, but you *can* help her by running errands and being obedient and loving. And remember that these seemingly unimportant things count tremendously. They can't be done without.

The Heart of a Child.

'Jesus called a little child unto him.'—Mt 18^{2} (A.V.).

'And when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them.'—Mk 9^{36} (A.V.).

To-day's sermon is about a little boy whose name we don't know, but about whom we read twice in the Bible. We can make a guess at his name, however, for we rather think—although the Bible does not exactly tell us so—that his father's name was Simon, and in all probability the little fellow was named after his father. He lived in a town called Capernaum. His father was a fisherman, so was his uncle Andrew, who lived with them. He had a good mother too, and a kind Granny who knew just what small boys liked to eat and who often gave him goodies.

But besides these nice relatives he had a special Friend, a perfectly splendid Friend, who often came to stay in the house. When He arrived He was sometimes very tired because He had been so busy all day, but He was never so tired as not to be ready to speak to Simon. He was a wonderful man, this Friend. Father said He preached better than any of the learned Jewish Rabbis, and He could cure sick people too. When the doctors and everybody else had given up hope He could make a sick person well with a word. Simon himself had seen Him do it. It was only a little while ago that Granny was very ill. She had been tossing and moaning on her bed with fever, and mother had been terribly worried about her, and this marvellous Friend had merely touched her with His cool hand, and she had been quite well all in a minute. Why! she had risen and made an extra fine dinner for the whole household, just to prove how well she was, and how glad she was to be so.

Then the Friend knew exactly what children liked to play at. He was always ready to share in a game. He could do extraordinary things with his fingers too. With a knife and a piece of wood and a hammer and some nails He could make you such splendid toys. Granny said that was because He had been a carpenter. And after you had tired playing games with Him or watching Him make toys, He was always ready to take you

on His knee and tell you stories. And what stories they were! You simply held your breath and listened hard. Father was a fine man, and Uncle Andrew was a good sort, but there was nobody—nobody in all the world—to compare with the Friend.

When He came to the house little Simon hung around fascinated. He could not tear himself away. He was a quiet little fellow, so he was often allowed to stay in the room whilst the Friend talked to the men whom He usually had with Him. (Mother called them His disciples. Father was one, so was Uncle Andrew.) Simon could not understand all the Friend said, but it sounded very beautiful, and it made Simon long to be old enough to become a disciple too.

One day he remembered especially well. They had all come in from a long walk looking rather overheated and cross—all except the Friend!—He never was cross! The Friend had turned to them and said, 'What were you reasoning about on the way?' Simon thought that an extremely polite way of putting it, for the disciples looked as if they had been having a downright quarrel. When the Friend asked them this question, however, they had all looked rather caught and had got redder than before. Then the Friend had sat down, as all Rabbis did when they were going to teach their followers, and the disciples had gathered round in an ashamed bunch, for they knew that the Friend had guessed the secret of their quarrel. Then the Friend had turned round and smiled to little Simon, who was hanging about as usual in the background, and stretching out His hand towards him, had said, 'Come, Simon.' And Simon had run forward gladly at the call and had climbed up (he was such a wee chap, you know) on the Friend's knee, and the Friend had put an arm round him and had turned and said to Father and Uncle Andrew and all those great tall men, 'Friends, you were questioning as you came along which of you should have the first place in the Kingdom of Heaven. I tell you that you have to enter that Kingdom before you can talk of being first or last. And I tell you also that the only way to enter it is to become like little Simon here. You must love Me as he loves Me, you must trust Me, as he trusts Me, ere you can enter My Kingdom. The man who would be greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven must have the heart of a little child.'

Of course, boys and girls, you have guessed long ago who little Simon was. He was the little son of Simon Peter. St. Matthew tells us about him and so does St. Mark. They tell us how Christ set him in the midst of these angry men and preached a sermon with his loving child's heart as the text.

And Christ is still preaching that sermon. He is still saying to older people, 'Love Me with the heart of a child.'

And what is He saying to the children? Is He not asking you to love Him as little Simon loved Him long ago? He knows that if you learn to love Him truly when you are young you will love Him all your days. He knows that the people who don't learn to love Him when they are children find it difficult to enter His Kingdom. They have to do what Christ said His disciples must do; they have to turn and become as little children before they can enter the door of the Kingdom. But the door of the Kingdom stands wide for the children, and though it is a lowly door it is high enough for each loving child.

Are you going to wait till you grow up and you find the entrance difficult? Or are you going to do as Simon did? Are you going to make Christ your special Friend while you are still a child? If so you will cross the threshold of the Kingdom almost without knowing it, and the Friend of little children will be *your* Friend for ever and ever, world without end.

The Christian Year.

Fourth Sunday in Lent.

The Rich Ruler.

'But when he heard these things, he became exceeding sorrowful; for he was very rich.'—Lk 18^{23}.

The story is one of the most interesting and illuminative incidents in the Gospels. There is a charm and attractiveness about the young man that delights every reader. He was, undoubtedly, one who belonged to the best type of the earnest religious class of his day. He was a character very much after Jesus' own heart, for we are told that the Master loved him the moment He saw him. This means something more than His general love to every member of the human race. It denotes that special kinship of soul which is

the real basis of every genuine friendship. Let us see if we can discover the qualities in the young man that called forth this feeling.

1. *Curiosity.* — Many youths would approach the circle which always formed whenever Socrates talked or argued, from mere curiosity or as a resource to pass away an hour; and at first they would look with indifference or contempt on the mean and poorly dressed figure in the centre, but gradually their interest was aroused, their attention grew fixed, and then their hearts beat faster, their eyes swam with tears, and their very souls were touched and thrilled by the voice of the charmer. They came again and again to listen; and so by degrees that company of friends was formed whose devotion and affection to their master is the best testimony to the magic powers of his words.

2. *Idealism.*—The young man had a great and noble purpose, and could express it clearly. To him spiritual values seemed supreme. We are bound to say 'seemed,' for the sequel of the story shows he had not thought them out to their final issues. But, so far as he knew, he was prepared to do anything in his power to attain the highest ends. 'Good Teacher,' he cried, 'what am I to do to inherit life eternal?' His mind was open to the best thought of the day, and in terms of that thought he uttered his great desire.

There are few finer sights than to see a human soul prompted by the best and purest impulses. There is so much materialism always prevalent in life, that the 'dreamer of dreams' is a welcome variety. Besides, it is to them that the race owes all its progress. They are the really practical people, for they see first and proclaim the possibilities. They announce the goal which not they alone, but others also may reach. Like Arnold of Rugby, in his son's poem:

> There are some whom a thirst,
> Ardent, unquenchable, fires,
> Not with the crowd to be spent,
> Nor without aim to go round
> In an eddy of purposeless dust,
> Effort unmeaning and vain.

In our own day we have had one splendid and outstanding example of idealism in the service of truth in the person of President Wilson. He would neither permit himself nor his people to be frightened by threats or harried by self-interest into any line of action that was dictated by lower aims than those of the ideals he saw to be possible because they were true. He reminded the nation that a man 'lives upon a doctrine, upon a principle, upon an idea.' 'Do you love righteousness?' he said, 'is what each one of us ought to ask himself, and if you love righteousness, are you ready to translate righteousness into action and be ashamed and afraid before no man? It seems to me therefore that you are here as part of the assize of humanity, to remind yourselves of the things that are permanent and eternal which, if we do not translate into action, we have failed in the fundamental things of our lives.'

3. *Sincerity.*—When the young man was brought up against the challenge of the moral law he was able to say that he had obeyed its precepts. He was not one of those who deceived either himself or others. He was neither a hypocrite nor a prig. He knew how serious life was, and up to his lights he had endeavoured to order his life by the best standards. In our search for truth this is essential. Truth is a moral even more than an intellectual attainment, and we cannot reach our goal unless we are able to judge ourselves by the sternest principles. Self-deception is easy but disastrous, and the prayer of the Hebrew poet is always essential (Ps $139^{23.\ 24}$):

> Search me, O God, and know my heart:
> Try me, and know my thoughts:
> And see if there be any way of wickedness in me,
> And lead me in the way everlasting.

4. *Sacrifice.*—Truth always involves action. It is no merely mental process, however careful and thorough. It belongs to the whole being, and demands obedience to its own behests, which persistent discovery has only made more clear. The young man's wonderful progress entailed one further step. Jesus was not mocking him when He said, 'One thing thou lackest.' The further step was the crown of his career—was he prepared to take it? Here was the crucial test.

Truth has always had, and must ever have, her martyrs—Socrates, Buddha, Luther, Galileo, Dante, Columbus, and above all, Jesus Himself, have made this amply evident. Their lives are the story of this way of the Cross, which Truth lays upon its followers. Lowell has put it into memorable words:

> Then to side with truth is noble when we share her wretched crust,
> Ere her cause bring fame and profit, and 'tis prosperous to be just;
> Then it is the brave man chooses, while the coward stands aside,
> Doubting in his abject spirit, till his Lord is crucified,
> And the multitudes make virtue of the faith they had denied.[1]

[1] *Life's Adventure*, 37.

Passion Sunday.

The Ministry of the Silent Day.

'And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these sayings, He said unto his disciples, Ye know that after two days is the feast of the Passover, and the Son of man is betrayed to be crucified.'—Mt $26^{1.2}$.

The Gospels mark with distinctive mention the occasions of silence in the ministry of Jesus. But the most significant of all His times of silence was this silent day in Bethany. Matthew notes its time—'When Jesus had finished all these sayings.' He makes room for it in His numbering of the days—'After two days is the feast of the Passover.' The second of these days had its own events, which have been recorded. The first was the silent day of Jesus.

1. The ministry of any day depends partly on our need, partly on our desire, and partly on our use of its opportunities. But silence, and especially a chosen silence, has its own ministry to body and to mind and to spirit. One of its most gracious offices—the first in actual experience—is that of *recollectedness*, to use the old Puritan term. If ever it were true that the world is too much with us, it is true to-day. In our hurried, unresting, and even fevered lives, when too often our holidays and our recreations are as costly and wasteful as our toil, we need, and should desire, the ministry of silence. For, in all the haste and hustle of our lives, we not only grow weary, but we lose our sense of values. We fail in a due perspective of what life should be. We forget the high and the holy in our too constant dealing with the earthly and the secular. We need, therefore, to enter Christ's school of recollection and in quietness readjust the compass, and reorder the course of life.

2. A second and even higher ministry is one which all the mystics have proved and praised, and every man is a mystic in his heart. All these devout believers, as diverse in their minds and ideals as Bernard of Clairvaux and John Flavel, or Madame Guyon and Jonathan Edwards, have entered into that ministry of *vision*, which is never received except on a day of silence. John Flavel describes what befell him in such an experience. 'In all that day's journey he neither met, overtook, nor was overtaken by any. Thus going on his way his thoughts began to swell and rise higher and higher till at last they became an overwhelming flood. There was a heavenly serenity and sweet peace upon his spirit which continued long with him. Many years after he called that day one of the days of heaven, and professed that he understood more of the life of heaven by it than all the books he ever read, or discourses he ever entertained about it.' Few may rise to the heights of such an ecstasy in feeling, but all may gain something even better than the inflow of such a tide. The men who have given great service to humanity, and have been notable as men of fresh and inventive resource, have all known the day when they left the arena of the busy world, and betook them to some place of solitude, where the vision of the world's need and the vision of God's will were given to them, and they came back to create a new world after the pattern they had seen in the Mount.

3. Another office of this ministry of silence is one which meets a more universal need. It is its *power of renewal*. Every sincere man grows sick at heart with himself. He finds the times to be out of joint, and he finds himself to be almost despicable. Old evil habits cling to him like the shirt of Nessus. His hideous pride rebels against the humility which he knows to be the grace he resents. Beyond all, the mistakes and the errors and even the transgressions of his inner life smite him in conscience. He feels his need of being renewed, rebathed in the cleansing stream of Christ's forgiveness, quickened again with new life. Then he chooses a day of silence, and its ministry bestows its blessing upon him.

> The passive soul in waiting stands,
> To feel as flowers the sun and dew,
> The one true life its own renew.

4. But there is a deeper need, and a higher ministry of silence than recollectedness, or vision, or renewal. It is a *re-consecration*. To all men and women there comes the day when they must make, or seal, a decision. They are called upon to make a choice which will alter all their lives, imperil their future, and involve the well-being of their nearest and dearest. It may be the acceptance of a lot in which they will leave behind them all that has given their life its comfort and security. It may be the passing through an ordeal, in which heart and flesh faint and even fail. That is where Jesus stood at the close of His ministry. He had already accepted the cross. After the experience on the Mount of Transfiguration He had stead-

fastly set His face to go to Jerusalem. But no great step is ever taken in one single and final determination. We may come to a clear resolve that seems so fixed that the die has been cast, and the course has been chosen unalterably. But there come reasons and reasons. Barriers seem to be raised, counsels plead through the lips of those we love. Another course presents itself, as wise and dutiful, and we are at a pause. So Jesus faced again the ordeal of His cross. Its certainty became more certain as He taught in Jerusalem. He knew that Judas had already taken the price of treachery. 'The Son of man,' as Matthew writes in his brief mention, 'is betrayed to be crucified.' That was a word the disciples did not understand. As the horror and shame of the cross rose up before Him in a new vividness, as He saw Himself the victim on the world's high altar, as He remembered the men who had followed Him soon to be left scattered like sheep without a shepherd, He pondered again the will and the way of God. In this silent day He looked out on the path before Him. He looked up until God's purpose became as clear as though printed upon the heavens. Once more He resolved, and He came back to the homes of men with a quiet face but with shining eyes. He received re-consecration through the ministry of silence.[1]

Palm Sunday.

The Example.

'I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.'—Jn 13^{15}.

Three points deserve attention.

1. It is often urged against Christianity that it has hopelessly failed. After eighteen centuries men are not much happier or better than they were when Christ came. It may be so; but against that fact we place this other, that, in spite of failure and amid the ebb and flow of a fitful tide of effort and aspiration, the goal remains. Christian civilization has its vices, as pagan civilization had; at least they are branded as vices and driven into the shade. Christ has done this for us; He has fixed once for all the standard of Christian conduct. He is the ideal after which we are striving still.

2. But an ideal is not a rule which may be followed blindly and mechanically; nor is Christ. In earnest souls there is a disposition to ask: How would Jesus have acted under given conditions? and it is assumed that loyalty to Him implies imitation of Him. But that is impossible. The conditions under which the ideal was realized in history forbid it. Jesus never was a father, or an employer of labour, or the head of a state, nor can we say how, under such conditions, He would have acted. He belonged, moreover, to a particular age and community to which the complex problems that vex us were unknown. Finally, He had a mission, and loyally accepted the limits it imposed. In His teaching He gives no precepts but confines Himself to principles. In reverencing Him as the Christian ideal, we forgo the manifest convenience of an appeal to Him as the rule of life.

3. But then, and this is most important of all, the Christian ideal as thus identified with Him becomes a living force. St. Paul says: 'Let the mind that was in Christ be in you'; and again: 'If the Spirit that dwelt in Christ be in you, He that raised up Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies.' In these words this at least, if not this only, is implied, that, if the Spirit of Christ dwell in us, the mere framework, the conduct, of life will fashion itself according to an inward principle. Love, joy, and peace are fruits, not works; that is to say, they are not the laborious product of our own activity, but the expression of a new life. Originality and spontaneity are the marks of the Christian character; it is the creation of the Spirit. The pupil of a great master does not attempt to reproduce his work. He studies the master's methods, learns his secret, imbibes his spirit, and then applies them on lines often markedly his own. In Christian ethics we condemn the conventional and stereotyped. It has been urged of certain actions that, because neither Christ nor His apostles did them, they are wrong. And yet they may be right for us; and, even if they are not binding on us, it may yet be right to do them as a protest against the idea that they are wrong. The joyous freedom of the Christian character must never be lost.

I have the greatest respect for church-going and the time-honoured practices of the Christian life; I know their value; I fear the result of their neglect. Yet I will not, because I dare not, make them of the essence of the Christian life. Nothing makes a Christian, nothing goes to form a truly

[1] W. M. Clow, *The Idylls of Bethany*.

Christian character, but a free and loving surrender to the Spirit of Christ. Jesus was often misunderstood. St. Paul offended the Christianity of his day by a noble disregard of usage, in the interests of edification; we may have to do the same.[1]

Easter Sunday.

The Living Dead.

'And when he had thus spoken, he cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth.'—Jn 11^{43}.

Jesus lives. He lives to give life to others. See how while He was here on earth He gave life to Lazarus. 'Because I live, ye shall live also.'

Jesus called to Lazarus, and Lazarus responded to the call because, though he had passed through death, he himself was not dead at all, but alive. It is true Bethany was no longer his home. It is true he had disappeared from his old earthly haunts; but somewhere in the universe of God, and within reach of the voice of Jesus, Lazarus still lived.

1. And here we come across the first tremendous truth which is suggested vividly and powerfully by the words of Christ's call, *the dead are not dead at all, but alive.* And their life is a *conscious and personal life.* 'Lazarus, come forth,' said Jesus. On the other side, as on this, he was the same Lazarus still. He lived on as Lazarus. No doubt he had left behind the weaknesses and hindrances incident to this mortal life. But he had not become another and a different being. Personality endured. 'Lazarus,' said Jesus, 'come forth.' And our dead are not dead at all, but alive, and they are essentially the same people yonder as they were here. Death removes limitations and banishes weaknesses and sins, but it does not make those who pass through it into different persons. Intrinsically and essentially they remain the same. *They answer to the old names.*

I think there is nothing that bereaved hearts crave for more than to be sure of recognition. We get frightened sometimes lest death should have made such a change in our beloved as to make them quite unrecognizable. It is a needless and groundless fear. Heaven would not be heaven to us if we could not greet again our loved and lost and resume again (though in purified and exalted ways) the dear affections of this mortal life. But we need be in no distress or doubt upon this point. Lazarus was still Lazarus, and in the life on the other side of death.

Isn't there a pretty little story told about the mother of the great Thomas à Becket! Whether the story is truth or mere legend (as the more sober historians insist) matters little or nothing to me just now. According to the story, she was a Saracen maiden who fell in love with à Becket's father when he was campaigning with the Crusaders in Palestine. And when the Crusaders left, she, drawn by her great love, which was more to her than country or kindred, followed them in due course westward and found her way to London. And all she knew of England was the name of her beloved. So through London the strange maiden went, crying out, 'à Becket.' And in due course the beloved answered to his name.

2. The second great truth which we may learn from the text is that of *the authority of Christ.* He cried with a loud voice, 'Lazarus, come forth,' and he that was dead came forth. Lazarus was beyond the reach of the appeals and entreaties of his sisters, he was out of reach of all earth's sounds and voices; but, wherever he was, he was not beyond the reach of Christ's Will, and not beyond the summons of Christ's voice. Christ's commands run through the universe. He is the Lord of the unseen world as well as of this visible sphere.

Do you remember what the Psalmist says about the sun? 'There is nothing hid from the heat thereof.' There is more than a little of the poet's licence about such a statement. For there are tracts of our earth that are never visited by the sun. But what the Psalmist asserts of the sun, so far as this world is concerned, is true of Jesus without limitation or reservation. There is no sphere outside His authority. He is Lord, not of this world only, but of *all* worlds. He is Lord of the unseen as well as of the seen. He is Lord of death as well as life. That is what He said of Himself: 'I am the First and the Last, and the Living One, and I became dead; and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and of Hades.'

3. In the ancient Church this great miracle was treated, not simply as fact, but also as allegory and parable. As Christ raises those who are naturally dead, so He quickens those also who are dead in trespasses and sins. And this particular miracle was used as an illustration of the infinite reach of Christ's quickening power. There are three resurrection miracles recorded in the history of Jesus. And there are degrees in the wonderfulness of them. The first of these miracles was that of the raising of Jairus's daughter. The breath had scarcely left the body. The little maid had scarcely closed her eyes in death before Jesus' voice cried, 'Little maid, arise.' The second was that of the widow's son at Nain. He had been dead for hours, and was being taken out to burial. But the most wonderful of all was that of Lazarus, who had been in the grave four days and who had begun to see corruption. The miracles stand in an ascending scale. He raised Jairus's daughter

[1] J. R. Gillies, *The Ministry of Reconciliation.*

from the bed; He raised the widow's son *from the bier*; He raised Lazarus *from the grave*. And the old fathers used all this to illustrate the extent of Christ's saving power. He can raise not simply those who have just fallen away from truth and holiness, like the damsel who had just expired; He can save not only those who have been some time dead in sins, like the young man on his way to burial; but He can save the man who, like Lazarus, has been a long time dead, who is festering in his sins and shut up in them as in a tomb. There is no limit to the saving power of Christ. He can save to the very uttermost.[1]

[1] J. D. Jones, *The Lord of Life and Death*.

Notes on the Johannine Prologue.

By Professor the Reverend J. Hugh Michael, M.A., Victoria College, Toronto, Canada.

In his *Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel* (Cambridge University Press), Dr. Rendel Harris essays to show, and, as I think, succeeds in showing, that the source of most of the phrases of which the Prologue consists is to be found in the Sapiential books; he also propounds the interesting theory that the Prologue existed as a Sophia-hymn before it became a Logos-hymn, and makes the attempt to restore it 'to something like its intermediate form,' giving in the margin of the page on which the reconstruction appears the passages from the Wisdom books which have inspired the various clauses of the hymn.[1]

The present paper records one or two thoughts suggested by Dr. Harris's pages.

The presence of the passing reference to the creative activity of the Logos in v.[3] of the Prologue has given rise to much discussion. One question that inevitably forces itself upon the student of the Prologue is this: Seeing that an allusion is actually made to the creative activity of the Logos in the Prologue, why is the Gospel itself utterly void of any expansion of the idea? We should have thought that it would have suited the purpose of the Evangelist to attribute to the Logos-Christ some references to His activity as God's agent in creation. Inge discovers the solution in the Evangelist's conception of God. 'It is true,' he remarks, 'to say that the Johannine God is not an absolutely transcendent Being who can only manifest Himself through an intermediary. In consequence of this, the *creative* function of the Logos loses its interest for St. John, and is not referred to again after the Prologue.'[2] It may well be that the perils inherent in incipient Gnosticism led our Evangelist to lay little emphasis upon the creative function of the Logos-Christ, for fear he might seem to be countenancing the conception of God which represents Him as keeping utterly aloof from the world. It is only necessary to remind ourselves of the words attributed to Jesus in 5^{17}—'My Father worketh even until now'—to see how far removed from this is the Johannine conception of God. All this, however, only brings the student face to face with the converse question: Why, then, is any allusion made at all to the creative activity of the Logos? Scott finds the answer to this question in the writer's desire to pay some deference to the prevailing thought; he remarks that in the Prologue 'the sequence of thought would still be complete although the brief allusion were omitted,' and adds: 'It is thrown out, apparently, by way of acknowledgment of the recognized theory. Some reference to the cosmic significance of the Logos was necessary if any link with previous speculation was to be preserved.'[3] The word 'apparently' betrays that Scott is not perfectly satisfied with this explanation. The Sophia-song hypothesis comes to our aid with a much more reasonable solution. It frees the Evangelist from responsibility for the presence in the Prologue of the brief allusion to the creative function of the Logos, and thereby relieves the student of the necessity of attempting to reconcile its presence in the Prologue with the

[1] *Origin of the Prologue*, p. 43. Several misprints have crept into the list of references.

[2] 'Cambridge Biblical Essays,' *The Theology of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 277.

[3] *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 157.

utter absence of reference to the idea in the body of the Gospel. Words which in the earlier form of the song spoke of Wisdom as the agent in creation, were in the later form applied to the Logos and we find them in the Prologue just because the Evangelist found them in the song.

On the difficult but interesting question of the syntax of the word πλήρης in v.[14], Dr. Harris's treatise gives us no direct guidance. In the reconstructed hymn we read:

> She tabernacled with us, and we saw her splendour, the splendour of the Father's Only Child,
> Full of Grace and Truth.

Here the syntax of the word 'full' is as doubtful as that of πλήρης in the Prologue, but opposite the line 'Full of Grace and Truth' is printed 'Sap. Sol. iii. 9.' If the source of the clause is correctly indicated by this text from the Wisdom of Solomon, then some corroboration is furnished for a view of the syntax of πλήρης which I have held for some time. Πλήρης is often troublesome. Moulton remarks that 'in almost every N.T. occurrence of an oblique case of this word we meet with the indeclinable form in good uncials,' and on the particular passage we are discussing he writes as follows: 'B. Weiss and others would make the adjective depend in some sense upon αὐτοῦ, but δόξαν seems more appropriate, from the whole trend of the sentence: it is the "glory" or "self-revelation" of the word that is "full of grace and truth." One might fairly doubt whether expositors would have thought of making καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα . . . πατρός a parenthesis, had it not been for the supposed necessity of construing πλήρης as a nominative.'[1] I am in hearty agreement with my late lamented tutor in his reluctance to make the πλήρης depend upon αὐτοῦ, though I notice that Plummer[2] is of the number of the 'others' who associate themselves with B. Weiss. It is the most unlikely suggestion that has been made as regards the syntax of πλήρης. But if I agree with Moulton in rejecting Weiss's view, I am far from being convinced that his own suggestion is much more satisfactory. I find it very hard to believe that the adjective goes with δόξαν. Would the writer speak of the *glory* of the Logos as 'full of grace and truth'? It would be strange indeed if the fulness were attributed to an abstract quality like glory; and yet Moulton has Moffatt for an ally, for his rendering is: 'We have seen his glory —glory such as an only son enjoys from his father —seen it to be full of grace and reality.'[3] If choice had to be made between one of these views and the old view that the words πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας are somewhat loosely attached to the rest of the sentence, the adjective describing the subject of ἐσκήνωσεν, the latter would receive my willing suffrage. But we have not yet exhausted all possible ways of construing the clause. Why should not πλήρης be taken as qualifying πατρός? If it is so taken, it is, of course, indeclinable. It is natural to take πλήρης with πατρός in view of the order of the words, and this construction is almost put beyond dispute by the fact that μενογενοῦς and πατρός are both anarthrous. Are we to take no cognizance of the arresting absence of the article? But what are we to make of the phrase —δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός? R.V. margin gives the literal rendering: '(glory as of) an only begotten from a father.' What does that mean? It is only by tacitly supplying the double τοῦ that the ordinary translation attaches a meaning to the phrase. Has an only begotten from a father as such any particular glory? A little thought shows that the comparison in the phrase—and the ὡς makes it clear that a comparison is being made—has no intelligible meaning unless the father be described. We can assume that an only begotten will be like the father from whom he comes—that the splendour of the father will be reproduced in the only begotten son—but not until we know the father shall we know the son. Now here we have, ready to our hand, words which may be taken as describing the father, and which by implication enable us to know the only begotten from the father so described. If we know that the father is full of grace and truth, then we know that the glory of an only begotten from such a father is the glory of one who is himself full of grace and truth. It would be no valid objection to this way of taking the πλήρης in v.[14] to say that the πλήρωμα of v.[16] is that of the Logos, inasmuch as in the former verse the implication is clear that the only begotten son shares the πλήρωμα of the father from whom he comes. Now how does Sap. Sol. 3[9], which Dr. Harris regards as the source of the expression 'Full of grace and truth,'

[1] *Prolegomena*, p. 50.

[2] Cambridge Greek Testament, *ad loc.* (p 72).

[3] Souter also adopts this view: see his *Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*, *s.v.* πλήρης.

corroborate this way of construing πλήρης? What do we read in this text from the Wisdom of Solomon? We read that 'grace and mercy' are the Lord's gifts 'to his chosen' (ὅτι χάρις καὶ ἔλεος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ), while an earlier clause in the same verse tells us that 'they that trust on him shall understand truth.' The verse does not associate grace and truth with Sophia; indeed, Wisdom is not once mentioned in the great paragraph, Sap. Sol. 3[1-9]. If, then, the hypothesis is valid that that text from the Wisdom of Solomon is the source that inspired the words which we are discussing, the presumption is not unreasonable that the Sophia-hymn applied the words 'full of grace and truth' to Him from whom Wisdom came, and the syntactical concomitance of πλήρης and πατρός receives interesting attestation.

To take one other point, Dr. Rendel Harris argues that the Pleroma attributed to the Logos in the Prologue has developed out of a Pleroma originally attributed to Sophia, and that this latter was a Pleroma of Law.[1] In the Prologue this has become a Pleroma of Grace. Indeed, the change from Law to Grace had in part been made already in regard to Sophia by the Wisdom of Solomon, and Dr. Harris thinks that in the Sophia-song underlying the Prologue the counterpart of vv.[16. 17] ran as follows:

From her pleroma we have received Grace instead of Law,
For Law came by Moses,
Grace and Mercy came by Sophia.

Now this has suggested to me the possibility that *in the Prologue itself* the unusual and difficult expression χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος (v.[16]) may have usurped, through some accident, the place of the genuine reading χάριν ἀντὶ νόμου. It would be easy for an early scribe with χάρις in his mind to write χάριτος instead of νόμου, and the error thus born of a momentary carelessness may have bequeathed to us the difficult reading of the traditional text. Be that as it may, it is at once evident that if νόμου could replace χάριτος, the change would afford considerable relief. Indeed, so signal is the relief, it may be said to amount to a justification of the change.

For one thing, the suggested change would enable us to give the word χάρις in v.[16] the same meaning that it has in vv.[14. 17]. If the traditional text is retained, we are bound to render χάρις in v.[16] as if it were χάρισμα, a separate, distinct bestowment of grace, a single manifestation of the Divine favour, whereas in vv.[14. 17], as is generally the case in the New Testament when the χάρις of God in Christ is spoken of, the word stands for the whole fund of Divine goodwill and favour which has (so to say) taken up its abode in the Logos and by Him finds its way to men. Of course it would be folly to insist that in the poetic language of our Prologue a word should have the same shade of meaning in all its occurrences, but I find it difficult to think that in this stately passage the middle of the three occurrences of the word departs from the lofty general sense which it bears both immediately before and immediately after.

Again, in the usual text of v.[16], even if χάρις be taken to stand for a particular gift of the Divine grace, it is still difficult to give to the preposition ἀντί its natural normal meaning. Speaking of ἀντί Moulton says: '"In front of," with a normal adnominal genitive, passes naturally into "in place of," with the idea of equivalence or return or substitution, our *for*.'[2] Now I find it difficult to think that any sacred writer would speak of one gift of God's grace being bestowed *in stead of, as a substitute for*, a previous gift. The statement that one gift is bestowed, and received, *after* another is intelligible. That is how Moffatt renders here: 'For we have all been receiving grace after grace from his fulness.' But if that is the meaning intended to be conveyed by the sentence, it is natural to ask why a different preposition was not employed. 'After' is not a legitimate rendering of ἀντί; and the same applies to other suggested paraphrases. The text as it stands connotes—and the connotation is strange and unwarranted—that one gift of grace must be done away with—discarded like a worn-out garment—before another can be received; it implies that like an inoculation the gift of Divine grace exhausts itself, whereupon its place is taken by another. The three or four more or less apposite parallels which have been discovered do not greatly help to reconcile one to the forced interpretation of ἀντί demanded by the traditional text, though it must be admitted that the example cited from Philo's *De Poster. Caini*, § 145, is, as Moulton remarks, 'an excellent parallel,'[3] predisposing us to admit a similar use in the Fourth Gospel.

There is yet another consideration which should minimize our reluctance to doubt the originality of

[1] See *Origin of the Prologue*, pp. 35 ff.

[2] *Prolegomena*, p. 100.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 100.

χάριτος. Not only is the substitution of νόμου necessary in order to bring the meaning of χάρις in v.[16] into harmony with its significance in vv.[14, 17] and to enable us to give to ἀντί its natural and normal force: it seems to be demanded also by the very structure of v.[17]. The verse consists of two co-ordinate clauses, and it is difficult to think that the giving of the Law through Moses and the coming of Grace and Truth through Jesus Christ would have been contrasted as they here are in parallel and co-ordinate statements, unless the preceding sentence had contained some reference to Law as well as Grace. It must not be forgotten of course, that the Prologue is composed in simple Greek replete with Semitic methods of expression, and that consequently no surprise should be occasioned by the presence of co-ordinate clauses placed side by side where the truth could be expressed with greater precision by a more complex manipulation of clauses; still, if v.[16] contains no reference whatsoever to the Law, but only to the Grace which comes through the Logos, it is most unnatural to introduce into the ὅτι clause, which attests the proposition laid down in v.[16], a statement concerning the Law parallel and co-ordinate with the statement concerning Grace. The manner in which the reference to the Law is introduced in v.[17] is harsh and unexpected unless something has been said about the Law in the preceding sentence.

Contributions and Comments.

The Christian Church.[1]

THERE was room for such a work as this, and the author has placed students of historical Christianity in his debt. Those whose first introduction to general Church History was through Kurtz's grim volumes will be tempted to think they were born too soon. We needed a new up-to-date manual less elaborate than Kurtz's or Moeller's, and this work supplies the need. It furnishes a token too of the enterprise of American scholarship in this particular field. For the only other competing text-book in the English language, Dr. George P. Fisher's one-volume work, came also from America—and was it not also from the self-same University of Yale?

Unquestionably Professor Walker has done his task, of comprising the story of the Church within 600 pages, with conspicuous ability and success. A success all the more notable that the growth of Christian doctrine comes within his purview, as also the development of Christian thought in general. Opinions will, of course, differ as to the writer's discrimination and judgment in the selection of his material and in the proportion of his treatment of it. It might be urged, for example, that he should have given more space to the Pelagian controversy and traced its far-reaching issues with a firmer hand. Most of us, however, will agree that we have here a well-written book, in a clear and readable style, accurate in scholarship, catholic in sympathy, in tone fair-minded and dispassionate. It is informed also with the true historical spirit, and it reflects throughout a quiet spiritual earnestness. Only once indeed in the course of the work does the author appear to let himself go. It is in the closing paragraph, and the words are worth quoting: 'The long story of the Christian Church is a panorama of lights and shadows, of achievement and failure, of conquests and divisions. It has exhibited the divine life marvellously transforming the lives of men. It has also exhibited those passions and weaknesses of which human nature is capable. Its tasks have seemed, in every age, almost insuperable. They were never greater than at present when confronted by a materialistic interpretation of life, and when the furnace of almost universal war bids fair to transform the whole fabric of European and American civilization. Yet no Christian can survey what the Church has done without confidence in its future. Its changes may be many, its struggles great. But the good hand of God which has led it hitherto will guide it to larger usefulness in the advancement of the kingdom of its Lord, and toward the fulfilment of His prediction that if He be lifted up He would draw all men unto Him.'

The writer has his standpoints. His ecclesiastical standpoint, if we mistake not, is Congrega-

[1] *A History of the Christian Church*, by Williston Walker. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 14s. net.

tionalist. But one could hardly gather that from his pages; though it is not without significance that he shows an intimate knowledge of the movement of Puritanism and Congregationalism in England, and that he is careful to trace the roots of Congregationalism back to the days of the Anabaptists. His theological standpoint is not obtruded either. One gathers that it is evangelical, broad, and modern. The writer appears to be in sympathy with advanced critical views in the sphere of Biblical study, and in the sphere of Christian doctrine to have felt the force of the Ritschlian movement. Like Dr. Adams Brown and other recent American theologians who have learned of Ritschl, he is fond of distinguishing between the 'what' and the 'how,'—between the religious value of a doctrine and its theological or philosophical implications.

Where the style is so good, it is perhaps hypercritical to remark on occasional lapses or defects. But now and then the sentences become jerky and disjointed, or an awkward phrase is used, or for brevity's sake the form of a statement is unduly sacrificed. These criticisms we could readily substantiate.

Where the accuracy is so great, it is perhaps hypercritical also to take notice of a reference which if not inaccurate is at least misleading. Writing on Scottish divisions and reunions, Dr. Walker says: 'The vast majority of independent Presbyterians being thus joined in the United Free Church of Scotland, and many of the grounds of contention with the state church having been removed, a union between the two in the near future is probable—foreshadowed by the merger (*sic*), in 1916, of the theological schools of the established church and the United Free Church in Aberdeen and Edinburgh.' Now this is apt to convey the impression that the so-called merging was more than a temporary amalgamation owing to the war. The bond of unity remains, but the union of the two 'theological schools' in question will wait upon the union of the two Churches. Nor is it altogether accurate to speak of the 'theological school' of the Established Church. The Church of Scotland—properly speaking—does not maintain a theological school of its own, but avails itself of the provision made by the Scottish Universities for the training of divinity students.

The book is furnished with a copious index and with elaborate and particularly useful Bibliographical Suggestions. The writer himself has made good use of the 'source books' he recommends, especially that of J. C. Ayer for Ancient Church History, of Gee and Hardy for English Church History, and of B. J. Kidd for the Continental Reformation; and he acknowledges this freely. He is to be heartily congratulated on the accomplishment of a peculiarly difficult task. The publishers are also to be congratulated on the performance of their part, and on the comparatively low price at which they have been able to place the book on the market.

W. Fulton.
University of Aberaeen.

Reconciliation with God.

'Be ye reconciled to God.'—2 Co 5^{20}.

Writing to the Church at Corinth, St. Paul was constrained to speak 'as one having authority,' to use language of rebuke and warning, to exercise his influence as 'an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God,' and as the founder of that Church in order to check tendencies and practices that threatened the Christian community, and to enforce the punishment of offenders. St. Paul had laboured long and earnestly to spread the gospel in Corinth, and his success there is in striking contrast to the result of his visit to Athens, where, in deference to the culture of his audience, his address echoed the thoughts of Greek writers, Euripides, Epimenides, Aratus, but won few disciples. Yet the Church in the city of the two seas was tainted with the vices of the society amid which it was planted. Corinth was notorious for its gross immorality and luxury. Plato and Shakespeare knew it as the home of impurity; alike in ancient and in modern times a Corinthian came to mean a man of licentious and extravagant habits, it was applied to Augustus himself in reference to the splendour of his life. As a great seaport the city drew within itself a heterogeneous crowd of human beings, as a place known far and wide as splendid in its architecture and magnificent from the wealth that poured into it, it attracted multitudes to whom it offered an abundance of sensual enjoyments. And, as always happens, material prosperity came to be identified with worth and even with life itself. The lesson had not yet been learned that 'a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.' There was,

it is true, among this pleasure-loving population filled with 'the pride of the eye and the lust of the flesh,' some stirring of intellect. It was too strongly tinged with a Greek element to be wholly indifferent to culture, but these were the days of the decline of Greek philosophy, and the wisdom on which its possessors plumed themselves neither elevated nor purified the soul of man. It puffed up with the conceit of learning and rejoiced not in the proving of all things that the truth might be held fast; but in hair-splittiug discussion that profited nothing. The Corinthians had built for themselves 'a lordly pleasure-house.'

> In filthy sloughs they roll a prurient skin,
> They graze and wallow, breed and sleep;
> And oft some brainless devil enters in,
> And drives them to the deep.

The Church in Corinth had not escaped the contagion of its environment. Such evil 'as is not so much as named amongst the Gentiles' was present in it. It was full of disorders; the Lord's Supper itself was made the occasion of unseemly indulgence, 'one is hungry, and another is drunken,' and of a display of class and other oppositions; envy and jealousy abounded; there was a spiritual pride that despised those less gifted, a worldly arrogance that slighted the poor; a general disregard for discipline and decorum in public worship; a trusting in mere intellect that created a divisive spirit and split the Church into rival parties. And the all-embracing explanation of these deplorable conditions, the Apostle finds in a lack of spirituality. 'The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.'

It is of the first importance to note that while St. Paul marks and punishes overt acts of sin, and lays his finger, with words of grave censure, on individual instances of flagrant disorder, he seeks for a comprehensive remedy that shall restore the inner life of the community and thereby reduce all their outer life to conformity with Christian belief and practice. What that remedy is he sets forth in the words, 'We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.'

And is not this the radical cure for the evils that afflict ourselves at the present crisis? Are these not strikingly like those that St. Paul rebuked in the Corinthians? During the war there were those that prophesied as compensation for its long drawn agony, its havoc of the nation's manhood, its darkening of our homes, its shattering of so many hopes, a purified world, a casting out of mammon-worship, a revaluation of life. Can it be said with truth that the nation as a whole is the better for the fiery ordeal it has passed through? Or that when one thinks of all the gallant dead, the sick and the maimed, the silent misery of those for whom this world is no more a place of light, the gain outweighs the grievous loss? The sense of moral responsibility seems to have grown weaker; the marriage-bond is lightly undertaken and lightly broken; the relations of the sexes have entered on a new and disquieting phase; everywhere there is a reckless blindness to consequences. Money has been made with fatal ease and is being spent with ostentatious profusion. On all sides there is heedless extravagance, a desire for ease and luxury, at a time when only hard work and forethought can rescue us from the pit into which we have fallen, and when some of the services on which the very life of the people depends, the Church and the School, are in danger of being swept away in an orgy of wastefulness. For the greed of money and the lust of the lower pleasures it provides have begotten contempt for the things of the intellect and the spirit. In wealthy suburbs there is a frank worship of materialism and a quiet assumption that religion has ceased to count as a factor in life. Church-going is ceasing, the Sunday is given up to games and the ordinary round of secular tasks by those with ample leisure during the week, and, whereas before the war motorists and others who meant to devote the Sunday to pleasure for the most part had some regard for the susceptibilities of those who spent the day otherwise, now there is an open disregard of them. And even in country districts church attendance is falling off, there is a noticeable increase of Sunday labour, and a decline of interest in what is not connected with buying and selling and making gain. This wave of materialism calls for a strong message from the Church to quicken the conscience of men. Political and social measures may go so far to meet the needs of the hour, but the only hope of thorough cure lies in bringing the nation to realize the vanity of the present pursuits that engross so many, the truth that material things never satisfy the heart. 'Seek first the kingdom of God, and all these

things shall be added unto you.' That is the truth to be taught and learnt. A. M. WILLIAMS.

Glasgow.

Friendship without Mammon.

WHEN preaching recently on the Parable of the Tricky Agent (Lk 16^{1-13}) I felt strongly the difficulties it presents. The only way to use it as it stands seems to be as an incentive to (*a*) prudence and foresight in things spiritual, and (*b*) wise stewardship of money. But this second point seems to involve our Lord's advocacy of the acquisition of friends by means of the 'mammon of unrighteousness' = unrighteous mammon, a Jewish epithet for 'filthy lucre'—dirty money. Is it really conceivable that He said such a thing? Would the Pharisees, who were lovers of money, have scoffed at Him for saying it? And can it be reconciled with 'Ye cannot serve God and mammon'? (Lk 16^{13}, Mt 6^{24}).

I venture to suggest what to me is a new view of this passage. I shall be glad if it has been anticipated, and if it finds support from readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Assuming that Jesus spoke Aramaic, what word would He have used for ἐκ in the sense of 'out of,' 'by means of'? Presumably the ב *pretii*. But the Greek ἐκ most probably was intended to represent the Aramaic מן. Now that preposition, in Semitic idiom, might mean 'away from,' *i.e.* 'without.' The most familiar instance of this use is in Job 19^{26}, where R.V. has 'from' in the text and 'without' in the margin. Other passages where מן has, apparently, a similar force are Pr 20^{3}, 'to keep aloof from strife'; Nu 15^{24}, 'without the knowledge of the congregation'; Is 14^{19}, 'away from thy tomb'; Gn 4^{11}, 'away from the soil'; Gn 27^{39}, 'away from the fatness of the earth'; Job 11^{15}, 'without spot'; Job 21^{9}, 'without fear'; Pr 1^{33}, 'without fear'; Jer 48^{45}, 'without strength'; Is 22^{3}, 'without the bow.' These references, in this order, I take from the *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon*, omitting the less clear passages in Jg 5^{11} and Zeph 3^{18} (see *s.v.* מן 1 *b*—; cf. also 7 *b*).

Did Jesus use מן, and in this sense? The answer would be clearer if similar use of the preposition could be found in Aramaic. So far I have not found it. But if the original preposition was so used clearly the Greek should be χωρίς or ἀπό.

Thus the verse would mean 'make friends *without* dirty money, so that when wealth fails (ἐκλίπῃ), or ye die (ἐκλίπητε), you will have a more enduring refuge.'

Some of the verses may have been dislocated as a result of the misleading force of ἐκ. I conceive that the lesson intended was something of this kind: 'Use foresight in spiritual things as did the tricky agent in things temporal. Be scrupulously honest in money matters; that goes without saying. You have, however, higher interests entirely, and those interests are spiritual.'

> Passing soon and little worth
> Are the things that tempt on earth;
> Heavenward lift thy soul's regard;
> God Himself is thy reward.

H. F. B. COMPSTON.

Bredwardine Vicarage, Hereford.

Luke xv. 30.

CAN any one explain the origin of the Vulgate reading of this verse, 'qui devoravit substantiam suam'? The Greek text is ὁ καταφαγών σου τὸν βίον. Why has the Vulgate 'suam,' and not 'tuam'? Wordsworth and White, in their large edition of the Vulgate, print 'suam' in their text, and also in Codex Brixianus (*f*) printed continuously underneath.

Their critical note is: 'suam.' ℭ (*i.e.* Cod. Beneventanus) 'tuam.' E.Q. (codd. of Jerome's revision). C. ff_2 i.q. (before Jerome). Bentley, et gr.

The Vulgate reading 'suam' could arise, perhaps, if σου were omitted from the Greek text, when τὸν βίον would naturally be read as 'his living.' But is there any textual evidence of this? 'His living' is more accurate, since the father had divided the property: but 'thy living' brings out the bitterness in the elder brother's mind.

FRED SENIOR.

Devizes.

'Faith.'

DURING the last few weeks I have been reading such books as Kelman's 'War and Preaching,' Morgan's 'Ministry of the Word,' Gordon's 'Isaiah,' Hutton's 'On Accepting Ourselves,' and also the volume on *Faith* in the 'Great Christian

Doctrines' series. I am afraid I could never sit down to read from cover to cover such a book as Moulton's 'Grammar of New Testament Greek,' say what any one likes about the captivating English style and so forth, but I have read from cover to cover your book on *Faith*. I feel I must write to thank you for it.

The number of books you have consulted to such good purpose is extraordinary. Take the first four chapters of the book, you put down over 120 books as books of reference. From this point of view it must have taken a great amount of painstaking work to 'read, mark, and inwardly digest' such a library.

You have certainly carried the plan of the book to a successful issue. Illustration after illustration, point after point, this, that, and the other thing to elucidate the matter in hand, but never has the main point been lost sight of. Not only is each chapter complete in itself, but the book as a whole is a full exposition of the great doctrine of faith.

I did not read the book with the view of detecting the least slip in printing, etc., but I have not come across anything of this kind.

I am sure every minister who uses it will find not only material but inspiration for his work. The great purpose of preaching and exposition is maintained all through, and no one could be better equipped for his work than by the study of such a book as this.

Might I say that while the whole book is suggestive, particularly so are such chapters as VI. The Venture of Faith; XII. and XIII. The Full Assurance of Faith; and XV. The Confirmation of Faith.

I cannot but thank you most heartily for the spiritual stimulus and help it conveys. Kindly excuse this liberty I take in writing you when I know you have a number of interests to attend to.

JOHN SMITH.

Rathen.

The Scapegoat among the Hittites.

IN 1908 the German excavators at Boghaz-Keui, once the capital of the Hittite empire, discovered some thousands of fragments of cuneiform tablets. Various circumstances, not the least being the war, have hindered their publication, and it is only now that they are being made available for scholars. Three volumes of cuneiform texts have been published at Leipzig, and books have been written upon them by Dr. Weidner and Professor Hrozny of Vienna, who has brought out a grammatical sketch of the Hittite language, and advanced its decipherment in many important particulars.

Among the tablets are a number of philological texts, unfortunately much broken, containing vocabularies in which the Sumerian and Assyrian equivalents are given of Hittite words and phrases. It is with these that all attempts at the decipherment of the language must commence. Fortunately the words of which we have the interpretation are pretty numerous and include a large number of the words in common use, so that with the help of the ideographs which from time to time replace Hittite words in the texts, it is now possible to translate with certainty a considerable amount of the latter. In fact, Hittite decipherment is already in much the same stage as was Assyrian when Rawlinson published his translation of the inscription on the Black Obelisk, or as Sumerian when I analyzed its grammar in 1870.

Among the unpublished texts of which I have copies is one containing a ritual law which shows that ideas similar to those that led to the institution of the scapegoat in Israel must have prevailed in Asia Minor in the Mosaic age. Here is my translation of it. It must be understood that most of the key-words in it are written ideographically, so that even before our present knowledge of the Hittite grammar and vocabulary had been attained we might have had some inkling as to its general drift.

'(The priest) brings a lamb[1]: he strings together a lapis-lazuli stone, a *shoham* stone, a green stone, a black stone, and a white stone: he makes these stones like a collar; then he ties (them) round the neck[2] of the lamb; then he drives forth the lamb to a foreign country, and repeats to it the following: "Whatever foreigner thou art who actest[3] according to the will of the god, thus we bring to thee with its neck tied this lamb as a scapegoat

[1] LU-ARDA, Ass. *immeru*.

[2] In the vocabularies the compound verb used here is interpreted by the Sumerian *gû-sir*, 'to compress' or 'tie the neck.'

[3] Literally: 'being-also-thee land-foreigner.' As in some of the Caucasian languages, the Hittite sentence began with what Hrozny calls a 'conglomeration' of particles, pronouns, and even nouns. *Kuis*, 'being,' takes the place of our relative pronoun.

for the god, and afterwards observe a feast." And with this ritual (?) he fastens the sin upon the lamb, and it is recited for whatever god acts according to (his) will. At the same time he fastens the sin upon Silver-town,[1] and then sends a message to the land of the Hittites. So he drives away the lamb,[2] with its neck bound, to the land of the foreigner.'

[1] *I.e.* Boghaz-Keui or Khattu, *Khattu* or 'Hittite' signifying 'silver.'

[2] Here written 'sheep.'

The compound verb which I have rendered 'as a scapegoat' and 'he fastens the sin' is literally 'sin-bind,' the first element in it, *seggan*, or rather the derivative *segganza*, being explained in the vocabularies by the Sumerian *â-gal* and Assyrian *isânu*, 'violent one,' 'sinner.' *Segganza* is the form denoting an agent, *seggas* being the noun 'violence' or 'sin,' while *segganwar* is the verb.

A. H. Sayce.

Oxford.

Entre Nous.

SOME TOPICS.

I believe in God, and I believe in you.

'I think of a doctor on a lonely village station, a very able doctor, but even more effective as a churchman and a leader in evangelization. Not long ago a convert was being baptized—a rare event in that difficult area—and he was answering questions to test his very simple faith. One answer he began safely enough. "I believe in God Almighty, and in the Lord Jesus," but then his training gave way to his experience, and turning to the doctor he burst out, "and, sahib, I believe in *you*."'

That story is told by Mr. Frank Lenwood in *Social Problems and the East* (United Council for Missionary Education). The problems are all discussed in the book, competently discussed as well as earnestly, and there are references for further study at the end of every chapter.

The Pleasure of Dying.

Sir Alexander Ogston, K.C.V.O., LL.D., Surgeon in Ordinary to the King in Scotland, has written his autobiography as a military surgeon. He has seen service in Egypt, in Africa, and in Serbia, and he calls the book *Reminiscence of Three Campaigns* (Hodder & Stoughton; 16s. net).

It has been Sir Alexander Ogston's custom to take notes of what he saw and did and saw others doing. These notes were full enough to enable him to write a continuous narrative of the events of which he was particeps. And so this is the first impression which the book makes—it is good reading, it is truly and undeniably literature.

Let us prove that at once. And let the proof be the description of a funeral—the funeral of a Boer general in the South African war.

'It was growing dark as we walked out for a hundred yards or so behind our hospital camp, and we saw drawn up in two rows facing one another a thousand soldiers, each with his rifle held vertically with its muzzle resting on the ground, while his hands were folded over its butt at the level of his chin. The ranks stood motionless, on each side of a white path which ended, a furlong away from us, in the square walled enclosure where the Boshof dead are laid to rest, and over its walls towered the pines and poplars and blue gum trees planted beside their graves. Down the lane formed by the soldiers walked four British officers bearing a litter, carried at the level of their thighs, on which was the body of General Villebois de Mareuil wrapped in a red rug, and at a slow pace they went on until they had entered the gate and disappeared within the burying ground. M—— and I walked to its north-eastern corner, as many others were doing, and looked over the wall. Ranks of soldiers within it formed two sides of a square portion of ground facing us, and in the corner beside us the body of Villebois was laid by an open grave. By it stood General Methuen and his staff, and facing them were a number of the enemy captives under guard. Some religious words were spoken, a Dutch prisoner came forward and spoke in the "Taal" language a short tribute to the memory of the dead man, when he withdrew a Frenchman followed with an oration to the "brave among the brave," and as each speaker concluded he shook hands with our general and

withdrew himself again among the guarded men. The body was lowered into the grave and the earth filled in upon his corpse amid absolute silence on the part of the whole army and spectators, while the pines above them were as if etched by the blackest funereal ink against the golden yellow patch still lingering in the sky where the sun had set and against the leaden gloom of the rest of the horizon where the thunder clouds were again gathering and the twisted streams of the lightning were playing. The lines of soldiers at the sharp command presented arms, and the bugles wailed out in unison the impressive call of "The Last Post," the signal which marks the end of every day and the beginning of night, when all in the camps retire to rest. The scene, the hour, and all the surroundings fitted well together, and formed a solemn ending to a valiant soldier's life. Then rang out "Order Arms," and the ceremony was over.'

Sir Alexander Ogston tells most fully the story of the Boer war. It is the best told story, from the medical point of view, that has been given us. And it is quite untechnical, so that the average man can enjoy every word of it. There is no doubt a purpose, and a medical purpose, in the telling of it. Sir Alexander Ogston has done much to improve the conditions of living (or dying) in hospital in time of war. He means to do more yet, and he has written this book to help him to do it. In that connexion, however, it is enough for us to notice that he has strong faith in the nurse—the English (we hear his correction—*Scottish*—but let the word go) the English nurse. Scarcely ever did one fail him, and he expected great things; nearly always with all his expectations he was astonished at their unselfishness and their endurance.

One strange passage had better be given in full. Sir Alexander lay in the hospital at Bloemfontein, dying, as it was thought, of typhoid, and he says: 'I believe that unless there be such complications as perforation of the intestines, the death from typhoid is not an unpleasant one for the patient, however appalling it may appear to an onlooker. In my delirium night and day made little difference to me. In the four-bedded ward where they first placed me I lay, as it seemed, in a constant stupor which excluded the existence of any hopes or fears. Mind and body seemed to be dual, and to some extent separate. I was conscious of the body as an inert tumbled mass near a door; it belonged to me, but it was not *I*. I was conscious that my mental self used regularly to leave the body, always carrying something soft and black, I did not know what, in my left hand—that was invariable—and wander away from it under grey, sunless, moonless, and starless skies, ever onwards to a distant gleam on the horizon, solitary but not unhappy, and seeing other dark shades gliding silently by, until something produced a consciousness that the chilly mass, which I then recalled was my body, was being stirred as it lay by the door. I was then drawn rapidly back to it, joined it with disgust, and it became *I*, and was fed, spoken to, and cared for. When it was again left I seemed to wander off as before, by the side of a silent, dark, slowly-flowing great flood, through silent fields of asphodel, knowing neither light nor darkness, and though I knew that death was hovering about, having no thought of religion nor dread of the end, and roamed on beneath the murky skies apathetic and contented, until something again disturbed the body where it lay, when I was drawn back to it afresh, and entered it with ever-growing repulsion. As the days went on, or rather I should say as time passed, all I knew of my sickness was that the wanderings through the dim asphodel fields became more continual and more distant, until about the end of the term of high fever I was summoned back to the huddled mass with intense loathing, and as I drew near and heard some one say "He will live," I remember finding the mass less cold and clammy, and ever after that the wanderings appeared to be fewer and shorter, the thing lying at the door and *I* grew more together, and ceased to be separated into two entities.

'In my wanderings there was a strange consciousness that I could see through the walls of the building, though I was aware that they were there, and that everything was transparent to my senses. I saw plainly, for instance, a poor R.A.M.C. surgeon, of whose existence I had not known, and who was in quite another part of the hospital, grow very ill and scream and die; I saw them cover his corpse and carry him softly out on shoeless feet, quietly and surreptitiously, lest we should know that he had died, and the next night—I thought—take him away to the cemetery. Afterwards, when I told these happenings to the sisters, they informed me that all this had happened just as I had fancied. But the name of the poor fellow I never knew.'

The Hue and Cry.

Miss Eleanor Trotter, who wrote a reliable description of 'Life in Olden Times in Babylon and Assyria,' has now written an equally reliable account of *Seventeenth Century Life in the Country Parish* in England (Cambridge: at the University Press; 10s. net). Miss Trotter has style, but it is quiet and unadorned. There are no 'purple patches,' and we are sure there never were. But if the emotions are never excited, the intellect is never asleep. The facts are full of interest. And we are greatly impressed with the changed world we now live in. Take the matter of 'hue and cry' for example.

'The constable had not only to prevent affrays in his township, but also to ensure that no breaker of the peace was allowed to escape. If a felon, or even a person suspected of felony, fled out of, or came into, the township, the constable was expected to take the initiative in raising the alarm, for he alone had legal authority to enforce his orders, he alone could and did present at the Quarter Sessions any one who disobeyed him. When the constable raised the hue and cry, all the inhabitants of the township had to take part in it on horseback and on foot. They turned out of their homes with knives, bows and arrows — those weapons which they were expected to keep ready for such emergencies — and crying, "Out, out," blowing their horns, with shouting and uproar streamed after the fugitive. As the noise travelled over into the next township, so its constable must make his people take up the pursuit: thus "the hue will be horned from vill to vill." If a murderer escaped, the township was fined for negligence, if a robbery was committed and no township in the wapentake had captured the thief, the whole wapentake was held responsible and an assessment was levied on it to pay to the person robbed the value of the stolen goods: moreover every wapentake through which the thief fled had to take its share in making good the loss.'

Naval Wisdom.

Messrs. Harrap are the publishers of a series of 'little books' much admired by the book-lover and very useful to the speaker. The latest issue is *A Little Book of Naval Wisdom* (2s. 6d. net). There are quotations from as early a writer as Holinshed, and from as late a writer as Lord Beresford; and there are quotations from very many others between those two. What kind of quotations are they? Every kind, as this page, all from Nelson, will show:

'Recollect that you must be a seaman to be an officer, and also that you cannot be a good officer without being a gentleman. — *Nelson, December 1803.*

'There is no real happiness in this world.— *Nelson, to Earl St. Vincent, May 25, 1804.*

'Temporizing may be necessary in small states, in large ones it ought not to happen—it is humiliating.—*Nelson, to Sir J. Acton, June 1804.*

'Small measures produce only small results.— *Nelson, to the Queen of Naples, July 10, 1804.*

'I have learnt not to be surprised at anything.— *Nelson, December 19, 1804.*'

The New Testament as a Charm.

The Popular Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1918–1919 is called *Rebuilding on the Rock* (Bible House). It is as varied a story as ever and as entertaining. The following epistle came from a Greek at Gambela, in the Sudan:

'To the Director of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

'Respectfully I have the honour to inform you that I want you to make New Testaments in the Abyssinian language in a very small size, to be used as charms against the devil, for the Abyssinians. I want you also to make three pictures in it—on the first page the picture of the Holy Trinity, in the middle the crucifying of Jesus, and on the last page the ascension of Jesus. I pray you to let me know if you can do this book or not. If you can do it, how much is the expense? And how long before I can have it? And to whom shall I send the money? And I shall be much obliged.'

NEW POETRY.

Thomas Hardy.

In his eightieth year Thomas Hardy sees the issue of his *Collected Poems* (8s. 6d.) in Messrs. Macmillan's handsome uniform edition of the poets—the edition we prefer to all others and in which we especially cherish Matthew Arnold, Christina Rossetti, and Tennyson. And many of the poems

are due to his later years, many of the best, nearly all of the most melodious. For in his youth Hardy could not write poetry, but wrote bad prose in artificially correct lines, and nobody believed that he would ever write poetry. Thus it has been his lot to write the verse of an old man in his youth and the poetry of a young man in his old age. When he was seventy-three he wrote:

Out of the past there rises a week—
Who shall read the years O!
In that week there was heard a singing—
Who shall spell the years O!—

In that week there was heard a singing,
And the white owl wondered why.
In that week there was heard a singing,
And forth from the casement were candles flinging
Radiance that fell on the deodar and lit up the path thereby.

No one is able yet to see Hardy's poetry as a whole, and on the separate poems much variety of judgment is expressed. In substance it generally ends in an *ism*—pessimism. Is Hardy a pessimist, then? In his poetry? Assuredly he finds at every step he takes that something is obstructing his way, and he concludes that the feet of all other men stumble over the same obstruction. The whole scheme of things is out of order—if it is a scheme at all. And easy acquiescence is not in *him*.

Has some Vast Imbecility,
Mighty to build and blend,
But impotent to tend,
Framed us in jest, and left us now to hazardry?

Or come we of an Automaton
Unconscious of our pains?
Or are we live remains
Of Godhead dying downwards, brain and eye now gone?

Or is it that some high Plan betides,
As yet not understood,
Of Evil stormed by Good,
We, the forlorn hope, over which Achievement strides?

But that is not sheer despair. It is a question, with an alternative for answer. 'Are we mere puppets dancing to a tune which the Automaton sets? Or are we the poor wraiths and ghosts of what was once Godlike, but which has now hopelessly deteriorated? Or—and here sounds the voice of Hope, the last thing left in Pandora's box—are we the champions of some mighty project and purpose, for which we must cheerfully give our lives if only those who come after us may win where we failed? Mr. Hardy gives us no answer to these questions. "Earth's old glooms and pains are still the same." But what we catch in these lines is the whisper of that divine discontent which can never get satisfaction from a purely scientific view of the world, craving, as it perpetually does, for more light and a more comfortable assurance.'

William Stebbing.

It is a volume containing *Some Greek Masterpieces in Dramatic and Bucolic Poetry* thought into English Verse by William Stebbing, M.A., Hon. Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford (Fisher Unwin; 7s. 6d. net).

The selections are from Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Theocritus, Bion and Moschus, Apollonius Rhodius, and one anonymous writer, the author of 'The Swallow Song.'

Do you know the Swallow Song? We shall take the liberty of quoting it in Mr. Stebbing's 'thinking.' An appetizing taste it will give of a most enjoyable volume.

THE SWALLOW SONG.

IGNOTUS.

Ho! the Swallow, the Swallow is here, and She brings
From the South, and its sunshine, all beautiful things!
Hovering o'er glossy black back, or close pressed
In joy and in love to her buff and white breast.
See how the sisterhood of the fair Hours
Before her can lay a carpet of flowers—
How violet, primrose, myrtle and sallow
Burst into bloom to welcome the Swallow!
Goodman, fling wide open the gate,
Let not my Lady Swallow wait!
Bustle! Bustle! where is the cake,
That here they know so well to bake,
And the wine?
Brimful beakers, please;
With a whole basketful of cheese.
Hungry and thirsty, and coming from far,
Our Lady's not very particular;

But white bread, or brown, be it crumb, be it crust,
Spread a table for Her you will; and you must.
'Go as we came, and take nothing away?'
Her Ladyship does not put up with a Nay!
Good people, take heed! You hardly guess what
A spirit She has, the strong bill She has got;
She might peck off the lintel, or door's-self; then where
To go in, or go out, with your door in the air?
Or, stay: who's there sitting? Why should we not take
The trim little housewife? She's nicer than cake;
Our lady will tuck her tight under her wing;
Light weight for a Mistress who carries the Spring!
Says 'she won't come'? Well, hand out to us instead
A pancake, or bun, or a little pulled bread;
And a twelvemonth from now you'll be glad that you gave;—
A penny's in kindness worth a pound that you save!
To givers the gain;
'Tis all one to the Swallow!
Open your doors to the Swallow, the Swallow!
Nobody keeps his door shut to the Swallow!
Merry urchins are we; and why not you too?
Just slip off your years, and come into our crew!
On, Swallow, on; and, Boys, all, follow, follow!
Hail to the Springtide! Thrice hail to the Swallow!

M. W. Cannan.

You will not find a more poignant after-war note (to be poetry at all) than the note you will find in *The Splendid Days* (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net) of Miss M. W. Cannan. The news of the Armistice was brought into an office in Paris:

It was quite quiet in the big empty room
Among the typewriters and little piles
Of index cards: one said, 'We'd better just
Finish the day's reports and do the files.'
And said, 'It's awf'lly like *Recessional*,
Now when the tumult has all died away.'
The other said, 'Thank God we saw it through;
I wonder what they'll do at home to-day.'
And said, 'You know it will be quiet to-night
Up at the Front: first time in all these years,
And no one will be killed there any more,'
And stopped, to hide her tears.
She said, 'I've told you; he was killed in June.'
The other said, 'My dear, I know; I know. . . .
It's over for me too. . . . My Man was killed,
Wounded . . . and died . . . at Ypres . . . three years ago. . . .
And he's my Man, and I want him,' she said,
And knew that peace could not give back her Dead.

That poem strikes the note at the beginning. But gradually the bitterness of loss passes into the sense of possession, the possession of a love that death cannot touch. The living and the dead are simply waiting for one another:

When I shall come through all the world at last
Upon some evening late,
And Peter ask me what I did on earth
That he should open for me Heaven's gate,

I shall not try to think of all the things
I did, and failed to do,
But put my hands against my heart that is
A brown bird singing at the thought of you,

And say I was a woman, and I gave
One man all love I had,
And he went out to the Great War and died,
But since I loved him was made very glad.

And Michael, who is leader in God's wars,
Will take the golden key
And say, 'I know her Soldier, let her in,'
And turn the lock, and swing the door for me.

And the great angels will lift up their swords
For me as I go through,
And turn back to their watch again, and I
Shall hold your hands and be again with you.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Professor William Sanday, resigning his Chair in Oxford, has delivered three lectures, as if he would gather the sense of all his teaching into one final message. These three lectures, together with a sermon, a great sermon on the Atonement, preached before the University, he has issued in one volume with the title of *Divine Overruling* (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net).

The three lectures (we reserve the Sermon) deal with the three things of fullest discussion at the present moment—the place of the Comparative Study of Religion, the fact (or fancy) of a Revelation, and the reality of Miracle. On each of the three Dr. Sanday speaks the latest and most weighty word. For he knows them all most intimately, even all that others know, and he has made up his mind.

His greatest concern, and ours, is with Miracle. For it is the facility with which some can believe in miracle even now, and the difficulty which others find in believing in miracle at any time—these two—that are the most obvious and amazing signs of our day. Dr. Sanday does not turn his face to the Spiritualist. He is concerned, and very seriously concerned, with the mind of the man of science. If he must recognize a call from God to speak the word that shall help, before he is silent for ever, this is the subject on which he feels it must be spoken.

Perhaps no man ever realized more clearly how great a thing a miracle is. The modern tendency—we might say the tendency of the modernist—is to make light of it. Dr. Sanday is a modernist. He calls himself so. But he makes much of a miracle. The entrance of a force from another world into this, and not a spiritual force affecting our spirit—for no one doubts that spirit with spirit can meet—but a force touching us materially, speaking to us, healing our minds, our bodies, lifting us perhaps out of the grave—that is to Dr. Sanday a very great and notable thing. He may wonder that the Spiritualist can believe it so easily, but he says nothing. He does not wonder that the Scientist believes it with so great difficulty. To him he has something to say.

He says this: 'I have cut myself off by taking up so much of your time from the possibility of saying more about these subjects at present. It may be that, if I am granted the status and privileges of an Emeritus Professor, I may be able to say more some time in future. For to-day I will only set down the rather sweeping generalization by which I was inclined to explain to myself the instances of miracle which seemed to involve real violation of the order of nature. I do not

think that these instances are strictly historical. At the same time I *do* think that belief in them was encouraged by the fact that other miracles were strictly historical. A personality like that of our Lord, or in a lesser degree like those of St. Paul or St. Barnabas or St. Peter or St. John, worked miracles naturally and spontaneously. A conspicuous case would be that of those poor creatures who were thought to be possessed with demons. That calm, serene, penetrating yet sympathetic eye, fixed upon the troubled and agitated patient, brought healing with it. That is one example, and there were doubtless many more. But in the cases which we are compelled to reject, as at least not probable in the form in which they are recorded, I should be inclined to seek a solution under the general heading that the element of the abnormal came in, not so much in the facts as *in the telling*.'

There is some evidence that the great day of Spiritualism is on the decline.

Its great day. For Spiritualism is not of to-day only. It has often had its opportunity. But as there never was a greater loss of human life than in this great war, so never was there a more widespread desire to communicate with the dead. And that is what Spiritualism now popularly stands for—the possibility of communicating with the dead.

Its great day seems to be on the decline. This month there have been issued only two insignificant volumes, three or four magazine articles, and a sermon in *The Church Times*. And if it has begun to decline it may be expected, as on former occasions, to go down with some rapidity. Let us hasten therefore to point out what are the two fundamental fallacies that cling to it—not to hasten its departure, for that will come of neglect more than of exposure, but that we may recognize the importance of those principles which Spiritualism contradicts.

The first of the two fallacies into which the believer in Spiritualism falls is to conclude that the inexplicable is the supernatural.

How often does one read that this person or that was convinced of the truth of Spiritualism because, after all the explanation of the phenomena that could be thought of, something remained still unexplained. That something was accordingly believed to be supernatural. One educated man recently stated that he had gone through a vast deal of spiritualistic literature and had had some experience of mediums and their ways and still had remained unconvinced. Then one day he came upon a case which no explanation that he could think of would meet, and on that case he had surrendered.

It was a case of communication with the dead. We give it briefly. A husband and wife had agreed that the one who died first should if possible, and as soon as possible, communicate with the one who remained alive. In order that there might be no mistake as to identity or otherwise, they chose a sentence which the dead should make use of. It was an out-of-the-way sentence, and it was known to none but themselves.

The husband died first. No communication came. But in a short time the wife visited a medium. The medium declared that she had got into communication with the dead. Was it the husband? What evidence could he give of his identity? Some words of the sentence agreed upon were spoken. The wife was entirely satisfied. She believed that she was having speech, through the medium, with her dead husband.

Now let us ignore the circumstance that only two or three somewhat disjointed words were received. Let us suppose that the whole sentence had been uttered by the medium, exactly as it was agreed upon by the husband and wife. Is the only explanation a supernatural one?

Consider in the first place what that means. It means the introduction into the natural world of a supernatural force, with incalculable results. It means that henceforth we should not be able to assume that natural events had natural causes. It means that we could not calculate upon anything happening as we expect it to happen, that is to say in conformity with those natural laws which hitherto we have found to be observed everywhere throughout the world.

A writer in the current number of *The Quarterly Review* deals with the matter. 'It would indeed,' he says, 'be a revolutionary overturning of all the axioms of common life. The foundations of applied science—of engineering and medicine—would be sapped. If unknown spiritual forces add their quota to known material forces, then the best designed bridges may fall, the strongest foundations may shift, water may flow uphill. An element of indetermination and doubt is everywhere introduced, for all the works of man are based on the material forces which he can control; and, if they are subject also to unknown spiritual forces, nothing any longer can be controlled; chaos lies at the root of all things.'

He is speaking of some of the other phenomena of Spiritualism, such as the moving of chairs or the turning of tables. But the same uncertainty in life arises if there is indiscriminate communication with the dead. The uncertainty is even more disturbing. We should not be sure that our very thoughts were our own. In short, if we are compelled to believe that 'discarnate spirits' hold communication with us, using the words of our speech and otherwise taking part in our everyday affairs, this universe of God's creating, so surely believed by us to be an orderly universe, would become a scene of the most bewildering confusion.

Have we realized that? Have we realized that to some people it has actually already become so? The writer in the *Quarterly* quotes two medical authorities. The first is Dr. Charles Mercier, who writes: 'I know from my own medical experience, that the pursuit of the occult, and especially of that form of it that used to go by the name of spiritualism, but is now called telepathy, . . . leads to a morbid frame of mind, and tends to render those who are at all predisposed to insanity an easy prey to the disease. . . . An experienced physician cannot shut his eyes to the pernicious effects it [spiritualism] sometimes produces.' The other is Dr. G. M. Robertson, Superintendent of the Royal Asylum of Morningside, Edinburgh, who writes: 'I desire to warn those who may possibly inherit a latent tendency to nervous disorders to have nothing to do with practical inquiries of a spiritualistic nature. . . Inquiries into spiritualism sometimes lead to insanity in the predisposed.' And more recently (as reported in *The Scotsman* of Feb. 24, 1920) Dr. Robertson has said: 'I have received many inquiries to say more on the subject. I have little to add, save to reaffirm the statements then made. . . . It is strange that these phenomena, if supernatural, should occur most frequently when there is disorganisation and dissociation of the mental functions.'

It belongs to mercy, then, as well as to reason, that we do not at once adopt a supernatural explanation of any event which puzzles us, even after we have exhausted all the explanations that we can think of. It is a matter for science to investigate. It may be that the science is not yet existent that can account for it. Let it come into existence. It may be that certain of the phenomena which are called spiritualistic are due to something in man's personality which Psychology has not yet been able to cover. Let Psychology be stretched to cover it. And if it is not a fact at all, but either a hallucination or a humbug, let science find that out also.

When the War broke out the writer of these Notes was in Paris. In the hotel where he was staying there was a handsome German, with open countenance and engaging brown eyes, of the name of Kahn. He had at one time become a

citizen of the United States and carried his certificate of citizenship with him. One day Kahn asked the writer to go with him to a private room in the hotel, take some writing-paper, write on it any sentence he chose, and fold the paper. The sentence was written, the paper folded several times and held in the writer's hand. Kahn came forward (he had taken a seat some distance away) and told the writer what he had written. This was done again and again, and not once was a mistake made.

There was some hesitation over a proper name. For example: As the writer passed through London he went to see a cricket match at Lord's. One of the players had been run out. It was a very close thing. He wrote on the paper: 'Was Hobbs really out or did the umpire make a mistake?' There was a moment's hesitation in pronouncing the name Hobbs, but that was all. Kahn went through the same performance with other members of the writer's family. In every case he sat a long way off; when asked to do so he went out of the room; in no case was the paper provided by him; in no case did he take the folded paper into his own hand; in every case he stated correctly what had been written on it.

This performance was, and still is, as inexplicable to the writer as any case of 'communication' he has ever heard of. Was it therefore supernatural? The suggestion is absurd. Kahn himself would have laughed at the absurdity. It *may* have been due to 'thought-reading.' That was his own explanation. He had the power, he said, of emptying his mind, making it a blank page on which were then impressed the thoughts we were thinking. It may have been so. The writer believes that it was simply a clever trick.

Certainly Kahn was a scoundrel. He attempted to 'borrow' money of most of the guests in the hotel and generally succeeded. He even 'borrowed' a sovereign off a Jewish doctor, much to the doctor's disgust when he discovered that he had been 'done in.' Kahn travelled with us to London. Three months afterwards he was convicted of an attempt to obtain money by fraud, and was sentenced to two years' imprisonment.

That, then, is the first mistake. It is the mistake of supposing that the inexplicable is the supernatural. The other mistake is more serious. It is the mistake of supposing that the supernatural is the spiritual.

What is it that induces the follower of Christ to look favourably on the claims of Spiritualism? It is the belief that it is an ally in the struggle against materialism. That struggle is not so fierce now as it was in the end of last century. But it is with us always, and an earnest believer may be pardoned if he welcomes the help of any possible ally. Is Spiritualism then, like Christianity, the enemy of materialism?

By its name it ought to be. But its name is no more appropriate than is the name of Christian Science. For what is true spiritualism? It is the doctrine of the spiritual. And the spiritual is not communication with the dead. It is communion with God.

Let us be clear about this. Spiritual religion is communion with God. Wherever there is communion or fellowship with God there is spiritual religion; where there is no such communion there is no spiritual religion. If a man is in communion with God he is a spiritually-minded man; if he is out of communion he is unspiritual and in the true sense irreligious.

Christ came to restore men to communion with God. That was the purpose of His coming into the world, and its only purpose. The means which He used were His incarnation, His death on the Cross, and His resurrection. And we believe that every man who casts himself in faith upon Christ is restored to that communion. He is, as we say, 'accepted in the beloved.' He is a

spiritually-minded man, the outward signs of his spirituality being prayer and the doing of God's will.

Now the question is this: Does Spiritualism bring us into fellowship with God? Does it even profess to do so? It does not. Its claim is that it brings us into communication with the dead. But communication and communion are not one and the same. It is not found that the dead with whom Spiritualism claims to bring us into communication are themselves in communion with God. Their utterances, as reported by mediums or received by friends, are such as to make it evident, even painfully evident, that they are not by any means in communion with God. In some cases—it is with great reluctance that one refers to it, but in some cases it is manifest, if the communication is genuine, that they have lost the fellowship with God which they once enjoyed.

One of the books on Spiritualism recently published is a very small volume with the title *The Modern Craze of Spiritualism* (Morgan & Scott; 6d. net). Its author is Dr. F. B. MEYER. 'To me,' says Dr. MEYER in that book, 'the most startling instance was of a very holy woman I knew intimately, and whose one thought was of Jesus and His atoning Sacrifice; but who, when she was supposed to be speaking from the other world, never mentioned the name of Jesus, but complained of some trifling physical ailment which seemed to be troubling her. The absolute incompatibility of such a remark from one who must have been for years in the companionship of the All Holy is sufficient proof to me, at least, that the voice which spoke could not be hers. Think of the Apostle Paul, whose one passion was to know the love of Christ, coming back to complain of an ache in head, body, or foot!'

Yes, it is worth thinking about. Is the desire for communication with the dead after all a purely selfish desire? Is the father or mother of the lad who has given his life a willing sacrifice indifferent to his condition in the other world, and satisfied simply to have communication with him? If that is so, we have been misplacing our pity. Our sympathy is henceforth with the dead, not the living. There is a case of communication with the dead in the Old Testament. The spiritualist is fond of it. We recommend for his study one sentence in it: 'And Samuel said to Saul, Why hast thou disquieted me?' If our communication with the dead can only tell us that they have deteriorated in intellect and morality, it were a thousand times better that we left them alone.

So, whatever Spiritualism does, it does not bring us into fellowship with God. Why, then, is it called Spiritualism? It is so called through the mistaken idea that the supernatural is the spiritual. Spiritualism claims to bring us into communication with the other world. That is a supernatural claim. It is at once assumed that a supernatural claim is a spiritual claim—Spiritualism is a spiritual religion and the enemy of materialism.

The mistake seems to be made by those who are not spiritualists almost as readily as by those who are. It is never made in the New Testament. It is not made even in the Old Testament except by those who did not know what spiritual religion is; and it is indignantly repudiated by the great prophets. It is denied by our Lord. Again and again He was grieved because the people were so ready to run after the signs and wonders and disregard the gospel of the grace of God.

Not only is the supernatural not the spiritual, it may be the enemy of the spiritual. It is so in the case of Spiritualism, and that in all its manifestations, including the communications with the dead. For if these communications are real, they mean that faith is superseded by sight.

Now we know that it is by faith and not by sight that we enter into fellowship with God. 'No man hath seen God at any time: the only-begotten Son

which is in the bosom of the Father he hath declared him.' And how has He declared Him? Not by making God accessible to touch or sight or hearing; not even by offering Himself as the outward image of God, although it is true that in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily; but by making Himself a riddle to the senses and foolishness to the understanding, by throwing Himself and the Father utterly open to our venture of faith and hope and love and new obedience.

In a book, entitled *God and the Struggle for Existence* (Student Christian Movement; 4s. 6d. net), which has been written conjointly by the Most Reverend Charles F. D'Arcy, Archbishop of Dublin, Miss Lily Dougall, and Canon B. Hillman Streeter, the question is raised, definitely and inescapably, whether it is the duty of an evangelical Christian to work for the betterment of the world or to let it go.

Who says, Let it go? Most evangelical Christians used to say, Let it go; and many evangelical Christians say so still. 'Christianity, they hold'—the words are Miss Lily Dougall's—'Christianity is a system of religion designed solely to educate the human spirit to correspondence with a spiritual world quite different from this earth, and failure to desire and correspond with this present material life is the best preparation for the Christian heaven. They tell us that many of the greatest Christian saints have exemplified their entire incapacity to correspond to the things of earth, and that their Divine Master was in this respect their prototype, that the most characteristic of His sayings exhort His followers to the renunciation of all earthly ambitions and cares, and demand that they should follow him in disregarding the things of earth in order to attain an immortal heaven.'

Now it is no answer to that attitude to say that the Christian has nothing to do with an immortal heaven. The secularist says so, but the secularist has been put out of countenance since the War began. We need an immortal heaven, and we have it. We need it, not to balance the loss of this world with the gain of that, but in order to continue that fellowship with God into which we have been brought by the self-sacrificing love of our Redeemer. And we have it. All our belief in Christ is bound up with our belief in His heavenly life. All the love we have for Him is bound up with the promise 'that where I am there ye may be also.'

The answer to the Christian who says that his business in this world is to prepare for another is not found in a denial of the existence of another world. It is found in a recognition of two facts which now at last are sufficiently certain to alter the whole situation. The one fact is the evolution of the human race. The other is the social conscience.

The doctrine of evolution declares the progressive advance of humanity in this world. And it demands the deliberate exercise of the will in securing that advance. This cannot be denied by the Christian. It can be denied only by the secularist, who keeps God out of evolution as out of everything else.

Miss Dougall quotes Mr. A. D. Darbishire's *Introduction to Biology*: 'Far and away the most interesting question which can confront the student of life (is) whether evolution is a process of which a simple mechanistic explanation has been discovered, or whether it is not a mysterious process which we are scarcely able to understand at all yet, but which may, perhaps, be due to deliberate striving on the part of the animals and plants which have taken part and are taking part in it. And many will lean to the latter interpretation, because they find it inconceivable that we should know as much about so vast and complex and close a thing as evolution as we should do if the mechanistic explanation of it by natural selection were true.'

If, then, that stage of progress which has been reached in evolution is due to *deliberate striving* on the part of plants and animals in the long ago, how

can it be that all striving for the race should now come to an end? Is the individual to give himself to the salvation of his own soul? If the protozoa and their successors in the long, long history of evolution had been as independently occupied, where would have been the evolution and where would we be?

Certainly the individual has to strike out a path for himself. That belongs to the very conception of evolution. But the new path struck out by the individual has always been for the good of the race. The individual has usually suffered for his adventure. Whatever may be the explanation of the early stages, later evolutionary stages, says Miss DOUGALL, 'have always come about through conscious adventure, when the adventurer is called upon to give up the familiar "world," *i.e.* to set forth upon some unknown path—and that always at the risk of loss.'

'At every stage of man's evolution his progress has depended upon men who would walk by insight or faith in an idea rather than by what was obvious in their environment. Such men were persecuted, but, bringing salvation to their race, they might well rejoice. They might well say of their fellows, all following one another and approving one another, "Woe unto you when all men speak well of you." In an evolutionary sense these things have been true in every crisis, small or great, of our racial history.'

With this sense of the evolutionary demand there has come also a sense of the social claim. The Christian has discovered that Jesus came not only to recover the individual sinner but also to set up the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. Christ taught, says Miss DOUGALL, 'that a time would come when man should live in a blessed condition of perfect correspondence with his environment—that is, not only with God the Creator of all, but with men and with all the conditions of life. This state of things He expressed in the phrase "the kingdom of heaven," "the kingdom of God."'

The discovery of the Kingdom of God on earth is the discovery of the social conscience. No one can ever go behind that discovery and deny that it is his duty to work for the betterment of this world.

The Rev. Edward Carus SELWYN, D.D., succeeded Dr. Thring as Headmaster of Uppingham School. Now Uppingham School was Dr. Thring, and Dr. Thring was Uppingham School. And there is not a more difficult position in life than that of successor to a popular Headmaster. But Dr. SELWYN became as well-beloved as Dr. Thring, and lifted the school to a greater height of prosperity. After twenty years he resigned and gave himself to the writing of books.

His books have not been so successful as his Headmastership. There are two reasons. First he is original, startlingly original, and next he has no gift of expression. If his ideas had been in the hands of the late Dr. James Moulton, or if they had been in the hands of Dr. Rendel Harris, the world would have heard of them. It might have been edified or it might have been scandalized, but it would have known what Dr. SELWYN had to say.

Dr. SELWYN died suddenly on the evening of Friday, November 8th, 1918. Just before he died he had passed for press the proofs of another book. It has been edited with an Introductory Memoir by his eldest son. The title is *First Christian Ideas* (Murray; 9s. net).

Dr. SELWYN's great discovery (if it is a discovery) is this. The opponents of Christianity for the first century and a half were Jews; and in order to meet their attack, and if possible convince them that Jesus was the Messiah, the Christians made up books of quotations from the Old Testament, chiefly from the prophets. The quotations were read, perhaps in the synagogues (for there was much freedom in the worship of the synagogue), and were commented upon. These quotations

with the comments on them became the foundation of the Gospels.

Dr. SELWYN takes a passage here and there from one or other of the Gospels and shows how closely it depends upon some passage in the Old Testament. He takes, for example, the visit of the Magi to the infant Jesus.

The first thing is the Star. Balaam, the typical Magus of Mesopotamia, had foretold that the advent of the 'Man' of Israel should be marked by the appearance of a star: 'There shall rise a Star out of Jacob, and there shall be raised a Man out of Israel, and Edom [Idumea] shall be his inheritance' (Nu 24^{11}). Isaiah prophesied that 'kings shall journey at thy light and Gentiles at thy brightness' (60^{3}). In the same chapter Isaiah describes the journey of the kings. His words (in Dr. SELWYN's translation) are: 'All from *Saba* shall come bringing *gold, and frankincense* shall they bring: and they shall preach the gospel of the salvation of the Lord' (60^{6}).

These prophecies, then (and there are others like them), were brought together and commented on, and formed the basis of the narrative in St. Matthew's Gospel of the journey of the Magi or Wise Men from the East to Bethlehem. Even the details of the story are found in the Prophets. Isaiah mentions the gifts which the Wise Men presented. At least he mentions two of the gifts —gold and frankincense. Where did St. Matthew find the myrrh? He found it also in Isaiah. Not in the Hebrew text, but in that Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament which we call the Septuagint, and which was in far more frequent use in Palestine when the Gospels were written than the original Hebrew.

It is true there is no such word as myrrh even in the Septuagint, as we now have it. But one great manuscript of the Septuagint (A) preserves a marginal reading in which Dr. SELWYN is acute enough to discover the origin of the word. After 'gold and frankincense,' the margin adds 'and precious stone.' Now in Aramaic 'myrrh' is *môrâ* and 'precious stone' is *moq'râ*. The two words would be easily confused. Dr. SELWYN has no doubt that in St. Matthew's Gospel 'myrrh' is a mistake for 'precious stone'—a much more appropriate gift from a king.

All this raises a serious question. It is the question of fact. Does Dr. SELWYN mean to say that the story of the visit of the Magi has no foundation in fact? Is it merely an imaginary narrative, made up out of these quotations from the Old Testament, and with no other object than to confute the Jews? He recognizes the question and answers it.

He answers it, not when he is dealing with the visit of the Magi, but when he is describing the phenomena of Pentecost. For he goes over the narrative in the second chapter of Acts as minutely as the narrative in the second chapter of Matthew, and shows its dependence, phrase by phrase and word by word, on the Old Testament. Then he says:

'But what inference ought to be drawn from the fact? Was the account of Pentecost woven out of Is. 29 by a powerful constructive imagination? Or has Luke merely adorned his narrative from it? In short, are the events historical? In the Gospels we saw the resolution in Jesus to fulfil the events predicted, and could infer that he fulfilled them. Here it is again possible. The command in Isaiah was, "Be ye in ecstasy." The apostles resolved to obey it as a word of the Lord: they fulfilled it. There was, let us suppose, a great and widespread state of ecstasy that day. After this the other coincidences followed—the wind, the sound, the figures of the apostles illuminated (let us say) with the sun's light, as they spoke with tongues, incoherently, to be accused of drunkenness by the obstinate Jews. There is nothing incredible in any of these six records, and the events may have happened in that particular order.'

John Henry Bernard.

By the Reverend Newport J. D. White, D.D., Archbishop King's Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin.

The School of Theology in the University of Dublin has at no time produced a special type of thought or expression of thought as have Oxford and Cambridge. We are familiar with stories and sayings illustrative of the contrasted characteristics of the Oxford man and the Cambridge man—a contrast as noticeable in the sphere of theology as in other departments—but the *differentia* of the Dublin man is not so easily defined.

This is probably due to its negative character. The influence of the Dublin Alma Mater has never been exerted to mould her sons after one pattern, good or bad; the temper of the place is critical, intolerant of pose of any kind; in Dublin there is recognition of heroes, but no hero worship. This quality of independence of thought has defects of its own; it is not favourable to the growth of corporate enthusiasms.

If it be asked, what is the origin of this *genius loci*? the answer may be found in the history of the foundation of the University at the close of the sixteenth century. Perhaps universities and similar corporate institutions have a continuous subconscious life. Not only as regards the physical organism is it true that 'the dead abide with us.' It may well be that the aggressive Protestantism of those who in the days of Elizabeth founded Trinity College, Dublin, remains, in its essential quality, the predominating element in the spirit of the place, and affects the modes of thought of teachers and learners, many of whom may have no conscious contact with theology of any kind.

Hence it has come to pass, that while there have been eminent Dublin divines, beginning with the great Ussher, none of them has had disciples; the younger men who have listened to their lectures, in some cases with admiration, have never taken their instructors as masters, that is, as models for faithful imitation.

These thoughts have been suggested by the task set the present writer by the Editor of The Expository Times, that he should attempt to give some account of one of the Dublin men still living who have had an influence on the progress of theology during the last thirty years.

For many years Dr. Bernard was in close, almost daily, personal intercourse with two great Dublin scholars, George Salmon and John Gwynn, both of whom have left behind them works of enduring value. Yet there is no trace of the influence of either of them in his published works; and he in turn has had no disciples among the very many who have sat at his feet and come under the influence of his acute and powerful intellect.

John Henry Bernard, like most men who have attained to great positions in Church or State, began early his upward ascent. His intellect has the rare quality of comprehensiveness, capable of considerable proficiency in many branches of study: Classics, Mathematics, and Philosophy. He devoted himself in his undergraduate years to the two latter subjects, and graduated in 1880, at the early age of twenty, with gold medals in both Mathematics and Philosophy. Four years later he won the coveted distinction of Fellowship in Trinity College, Dublin, the examination for which is excessively severe; and almost from the first his strong and attractive personality began to be felt in the life of the College.

The obligation formerly laid on Fellows to take Holy Orders ceased shortly before the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland in 1869; and none of the Fellows elected since 1865 had been ordained. It was, then, significant of Mr. Bernard's plan for his life that he took Orders in 1886. In 1888, the second Theological Chair in the University, that of Archbishop King's Lecturer, became vacant through the promotion of Dr. Gwynn to the Regius Professorship. Dr. Salmon, who had just been made Provost, recognized the potentialities of Mr. Bernard; and the young Fellow was preferred for this important and responsible post above several men of ripe scholarship and wide experience.

Any misgivings which might have been felt from the youth and inexperience of the new Professor

were soon laid to rest by the masterly way in which he filled the position. Dr. Bernard held the Chair until his election to the Bishopric of Ossory in 1911.

During those years he made his mark as a theologian, a preacher and, above all, as an administrator and ecclesiastical statesman, quick to see the vital issues in a situation, and extraordinarily rapid in suggesting a solution.

His first essays in authorship were in the department of Philosophy. In conjunction with Dr. Mahaffy he published in 1889 Kant's *Critical Philosophy for English Readers*. This was followed in 1892 by a translation of Kant's *Critique of Judgment*. These two books are, if we except his edition in 1900 of the Works of Bishop Butler, Dr. Bernard's only contributions to philosophy, though his articles on the Fall, Miracle, and Nature in Hastings' *D.B.* exhibit a mastery of the philosophical speculations associated with those subjects.

Meanwhile, Dr. Bernard was acquiring a reputation as a preacher; not only in the College Chapel, but in the University pulpits of Oxford and Cambridge and in Westminster Abbey, etc. The appeal of Dr. Bernard's sermons is to the mind rather than the heart, or if to the heart then through the mind. They are carefully reasoned discourses in which noble thoughts are expressed in a singularly clear and firm style, often with great felicity of phrase; always illuminated by the dry light of the intellect, and sometimes warmed by a restrained enthusiasm. A volume of sermons entitled *From Faith to Faith* appeared in 1895; and since then others have followed: *Via Domini*, 1898; *The Prayer of the Kingdom*, 1904; *Christmas Thoughts*, 1913; *Verba Crucis*, 1915; *Easter Hope*, 1916; *In War Time*, 1917.

In 1902 that vigorous Churchman and faithful servant of God, Dean Jellett, passed into a higher sphere of service; and Dr. Bernard, who had been Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral since 1897, was elected Dean by his brethren of the Chapter. Here, his remarkable gifts as an administrator found wider scope and grateful recognition. Dr. Bernard made the National Cathedral a true centre of spiritual life as well as a pattern in dignified and reverent performance of the Church Services. St. Patrick's has always been famous for its music. The new Dean heightened in it the note of the 'beauty of holiness,' so far as is consistent with conformity to the Puritanical Canons, which make ritualism impossible in the Church of Ireland.

Although Dr. Bernard subsequently attained to the highest office in the Church, and has done conspicuous service as a Christian statesman, notably in the Irish Convention of 1916, it is perhaps true to say that the years 1902 to 1911, during which he was Dean of St. Patrick's as well as Archbishop King's Professor of Divinity, were not less potent in spiritual influence than the years of greater dignity which followed them.

Something has been said of Dr. Bernard's published work as a philosopher and a preacher. He has also made his mark as a commentator and a critical theologian. His commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles (*Cambridge Greek Testament*) and 2 Corinthians (*Expositor's Greek Testament*) have been found very profitable by students; and his edition in 1898 (in conjunction with Professor Atkinson) of the Irish *Liber Hymnorum*, for the Henry Bradshaw Society is a standard work of great value. He has also edited the *Psalms of Solomon* (1912), and in 1917 he published a volume on pressing theological problems entitled *Studia Sacra*.

The publications mentioned above do not fully represent Dr. Bernard's literary output; his contributions to learned periodicals are too numerous to mention. As Bishop of Ossory (1911–1915) and Archbishop of Dublin (1915–1919) his duties in the external life of the Church reduced of necessity the amount of time available for literary production. The world of Christian scholars will be grateful if Dr. Bernard's duties as Provost of Trinity College allow him sufficient leisure for sustained thought which may issue in the production of some more works for the confirmation of the Faith. Dr. Bernard's intellectual influence has always been cast on the side of a sane, liberal, and enlightened orthodoxy. He has never feared research or the possible results of criticism; his heart has never 'trembled for the ark of God'; for he knows that it is not really dependent on the care of men. The present state of unrest and uncertainty in human society calls to men of this quality to show themselves.

Literature.

ARROWS OF DESIRE.

Under the title of *Arrows of Desire* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), Professor J. S. Mackenzie has issued a volume of essays on our National Character and Outlook. His idea is that we ought to try to understand ourselves before we begin to set the world right. For, however it may be with charity, reformation ought undoubtedly to begin at home. But how difficult it is to understand the English character. Dr. Mackenzie is compelled to run his list of English characteristics up to the number of twenty-seven. How many of the seven-and-twenty would you as an Englishman acknowledge? The list is well mixed. It begins with Individualism and Liberty; in the middle you find Realism and Imagination, Fairness and Snobbishness; it tails off badly, the last five are Melancholy, Sentimentality, Cruelty, Hypocrisy, and Cant.

Professor Mackenzie is not so inquisitive with the Scots, the Welsh, or the Irish. Of the Scots he says: 'Zeal is perhaps their most striking excellence. What their hand finds to do, they do with their might. They are often very generous in their actions, but rather on principle than by a natural instinct, and usually within more definite limits. "The Scotch," says Beddoe, "are a generous race. . . . They may be parsimonious for themselves, but they are liberal for public objects." When they form friendships, their attachments are often singularly warm. Burns and Scott were conspicuous instances of this characteristic; but so, on the whole, was Carlyle—like the dog of Heraclitus and Plato, he attacked only those whom he did not know.' Of the Welsh: 'Enthusiasm is their strong quality, as zeal is that of the Scotch. They have the *perfervidum ingenium*, but it is a more quickly burning fire. It works more rapidly, but is perhaps less persistent. They do not, for instance, brood over injuries, but rather take prompt action, like that of Fluellen, though not always quite so drastic. They are generally described as choleric and impatient, not perhaps exactly of that swiftly moving disposition

> That carries anger as the flint bears fire,
> Which much enforced shows a hasty spark,
> And straight is cold again.'

And the Irish: 'Ireland is a land of paradox, and it is peculiarly difficult to make statements about it without falling into self-contradiction. Mr. Chesterton has used the expression "frigid fierceness" to express a common characteristic. I suppose it is not really frigid; or at least it must be compared with the quality that Milton ascribes to the glacial region in Hades. It

> Burns frore, and cold performs the effect of fire.

It is an attitude that may be contrasted both with the quick fire of the Welsh and with the slow fire of the Scotch. It is fire damped down, but all the more intense.' Then comes this comprehensive sentence: 'It is true that the ideals of the four peoples are markedly different—that of the English being, on the whole, the Gentleman, or, more generally, the man who *is* something; of the Scotch the Worker, the man who *does* something; of the Welsh the Seer, the man of insight; and of the Irish the Fighter or adventurer, the man who *struggles*.'

PRAYER.

The Rev. R. H. Coats, M.A., B.D., the author of that excellent book *Types of English Piety*, has now written a book on Prayer. The title is *The Realm of Prayer* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). It is a comprehensive treatise, somewhat after the manner of the volume on *Prayer* in the 'Great Christian Doctrines.' But its purpose is different, and so it gives less attention to the illustration of the subject. Yet there are quotations which illustrate, not a few. There is even a separate appendix of quotations of fifty pages. Of that appendix the author says: 'Most of the following selected extracts have been gleaned from the reading of many years. Some, however, have been kindly contributed by Dr. James Moffatt, and a few others have been taken, by permission, from Dr. James Hastings' *Christian Doctrine of Prayer*.'

The chapter of most immediate interest is that on 'The Psychology of Prayer.' Its central affirmation is this: 'The true way of regarding prayer, on its psychological side, is to look upon it

as a mutual spiritual interaction, in which both divine and human elements are mingled. Prayer is something more than a subjective exercise of the soul of man by which we seek personal self-realization through the affirmation of spiritual values over against the world. Account must be taken of the external spiritual power which calls this faculty into being, and continually fosters, directs, educates, and inspires it. Prayer, that is to say, is the chief means of perfecting spiritual personality through the intercourse of our moral will with the holy will of God.'

But there is an earlier chapter that strikes us as still more useful. It is the chapter on 'The Development of Prayer.' The very idea of development is generally absent from the minds of those who pray. Mr. Coats shows how the great privilege has passed from the prayer of the rude animistic worshipper to the prayer of the Christian saints. We wish he had gone on to show how necessary it is for the saint to pray, not as he prayed when a child, but now with the understanding also, a full-grown man's prayer.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. Fisher Unwin has published a volume on the League of Nations which is the most readable of the volumes we have seen on that subject. It contains ten essays or addresses by men representing seven different nations. The title is *The Nations and the League* (7s. 6d. net). Thus we have the British View (by Sir George Paish and Sir Sidney Low), the French View (by Senator Léon Bourgeois and M. André Mater), the American View (by President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University), the Belgian View (by M. Louis Strauss of Antwerp), the Dutch View (by A. Heringa), the Norwegian View (by Johan Castberg, President of the Norwegian Odelsting, and Fridtjof Nansen, the Explorer), and the German View (by Dr. Lujo Brentano of the University of Munich).

The German View is the most unexpected, both in itself and in its contents. For the author courageously and confidently assigns the war to two causes—our refusal to take shares in the Bagdad railway, which was undertaken simply 'to open up Mesopotamia,' and our determination 'to eject the Germans from their position in international commerce, which they have won by decades of laborious work.' It 'is solely because of this aim that they have compelled countries to declare war upon Germany with whom she had never had the slightest difference.'

The most valuable article in the volume is the introduction by Sir George Paish. Its subject is 'The Danger of World Breakdown.' Sir George Paish shows very clearly that the danger of a fearful economic disaster is not confined to the Continent of Europe, but extends to Great Britain, and even to America. 'Obviously,' he says, 'if America cannot sell its surplus supplies of cotton, a large part of the black population of the Southern States will have no income and no employment, and race riots and immense loss of life will be inevitable. Again, if the farmers of the West and of the North-west cannot sell their surplus supplies of wheat and of meal, a considerable portion of the people now employed by them will be without an income. Impoverishment of the South and West will soon affect the East. And America as a whole will be seething with discontent and with revolution. What applies to America, applies equally to all the other nations which so largely depend upon the markets of Europe for the sale of their surplus products. Indeed, it applies to this country in common with the rest of the world.'

His remedy is a guarantee by the governments of the nations (especially Japan and other countries which have profited by the war) of a capital sum of seven thousand million pounds to be taken out in bonds at 5 or 4½ per cent.

SCIENCE AND LIFE.

Mr. Frederick Soddy, who is now Dr. Lee's Professor of Inorganic and Physical Chemistry in the University of Oxford, was for the last five years Professor of Chemistry in the University of Aberdeen, and during these years he delivered some addresses and wrote some papers beyond the work of his Chair. These papers and addresses he has now collected into a volume with the title of *Science and Life* (Murray; 10s. 6d. net).

The range of subject is not wide. For Professor Soddy is the wise shoemaker who sticks to his last. He has probably not had time, we doubt if he has inclination, to know something about everything. Still, his occasional essays are not occupied entirely with Chemistry. All that we have a right to say is that they are restricted to

Science. Professor Soddy is the very incarnation of that ideal which we have in our minds when we speak of 'a man of Science.' He writes of science, he thinks in science, he lives for science. 'Science and Life' is his well-chosen title, for to him life is science, and science is life.

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that we should find Professor Soddy quite unable to understand theology. We do not say religion. There is not a word in the book which suggests the absence of personal religion; every word suggests its presence. But like many other men who have given their time to scientific studies, when he speaks of 'Science and Religion,' as he does in one most interesting article in this volume, he does not distinguish religion from theology. He does not separate the experiences of the spiritual life from their interpretation. And the consequence is twofold. In the first place, he is led to speak ill of religion itself, which he has no intention of doing; and in the second place he is led to speak ill of theology, without knowing what theology is.

It is true that at the beginning of his discussion he separates religion from 'the priests,' saying, 'It is the priests, not religion, it is difficult for scientific men to live with, and science cannot co-exist with priest-craft.' But even then he is thinking of religion as identified with 'priestcraft.' And in the opening of the next paragraph he makes the identification openly.

Now it is not true that the 'priest,' that is to say, the modern theologian (whom alone Professor Soddy has to consider), 'teaches that in some remote period of the world God Himself revealed Truth once and for all time, and his profession is to guard it against all comers.' That is merely the traditional conception of theology, handed down in chemical and other classrooms from generation to generation. And just as that conception is wrong, so also is the deduction from it wrong—what Professor Soddy calls 'another important difference between what is understood by truth in the realms of science and religion respectively.' This is the deduction: 'A truth that claims to be a divine revelation must necessarily be supposed to be the absolute or ultimate truth, which, by common consent, is unattainable by any of the methods of human inquiry.' We cannot but ask, however respectfully, if Professor Soddy has read for himself any competent modern volume of theology—any great manual like Professor Adams Brown's, or Professor Clarke's, or Dean Strong's; or even any volume handling a single department of theology, like Mackintosh's *Person of Christ*, or Ottley's *Incarnation*, or Lidgett's *Fatherhood of God*.

Now let it not be supposed even for a moment that Professor Soddy is one of the incompetent or professionally jealous critics of Christianity. He is very strongly sympathetic towards what he believes to be true religion, and he would at once acknowledge that for him true religion is the Christian religion. What his book reveals is the necessity that lies upon modern theology to come out into the open and compel the unprejudiced student of science to see that his notions of 'priestcraft' are (with negligible exceptions) out of date and unworthy.

THE SYRIAN CHRIST.

The Syrian Christ is the title of a book of instructive and illustrative material on the Bible, quite amazing in its volume and its value (Melrose; 9s. net). The author is himself a Syrian. Abraham Mitrie Rihbany is his name. He has lived and preached in America for many years. And thus he knows both what are the customs of the people of Palestine and what is the best way of describing them for us. He throws new light on ever so many texts, and for our part we have not the least doubt of his reliability.

There is a striking chapter on Swearing. Mr. Rihbany shows how frequent it is, and how sacred. It is even a sign of manhood. 'I remember distinctly how proud I was in my youth to put my hand upon my moustache, when it was yet not even large enough to be respectfully noticed, and swear by it *as a man*. I recall also to what roars of laughter I would provoke my elders at such times, to my great dismay. Here it may easily be seen that swearing in the Orient had so lost its original sacredness and become so vulgar, even as far back as the time of Christ, that he deemed it necessary to give the unqualified command, "Swear not at all: neither by heaven, for it is God's throne, nor by the earth, for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of

evil." This was perhaps the most difficult command to obey that Jesus ever gave to his country-men.'

THE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES.

The Economic Consequences of the Peace are serious if not disastrous. That is the opinion of John Maynard Keynes, C.B., whose book under that title has been published by Messrs. Macmillan (8s. 6d. net). Mr. Keynes was the official representative of the British Treasury at the Peace Conference up to June 1919. At that date he resigned, because he disapproved of the terms of the Peace Treaty. His disapproval was due to the belief that Germany was required to pay more than she was capable of paying.

What was Germany told to pay? Mr. Keynes says eight thousand million pounds. What is she able to pay? Mr. Keynes says two thousand million. He knows, of course, that the Germans themselves offered to pay five thousand million pounds, but that was on the assumption that they would retain their colonies and merchant ships. Without them, he says, 'a capacity of £8,000,000,000 or even of £5,000,000,000 is not within the limits of reasonable possibility.'

It is all very disturbing, if it is true. But there are considerations. One consideration is the ease with which statistics may be used to prove foregone conclusions. Another is the unmistakable evidence Mr. Keynes has given of his fondness for exaggeration. His estimate of the President of the United States is an obvious and enormous example. 'The first glance at the President suggested not only that, whatever else he might be, his temperament was not primarily that of the student or the scholar, but that he had not much even of that culture of the world which marks M. Clemenceau and Mr. Balfour as exquisitely cultivated gentlemen of their class and generation. But more serious than this, he was not only insensitive to his surroundings in the external sense, he was not sensitive to his environment at all. What chance could such a man have against Mr. Lloyd George's unerring, almost medium-like, sensibility to every one immediately round him?' This is absurd on the face of it, and it becomes ridiculous when the 'clue' is discovered. 'The clue once found was illuminating. The President was like a Nonconformist minister, perhaps a Presbyterian.'

ANDREW HUNTER DUNN.

In the Memoir of the Right Rev. *Andrew Hunter Dunn*, Fifth Bishop of Quebec, by Percival Jolliffe (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net), there is not a very full account of the work which the Bishop did in his diocese. Mr. Jolliffe did not know him there and has to depend upon the knowledge of others. But from what we see of the man we can surmise of the work. And the man is greater than his work always. No doubt it is in the work that we first discover the man. 'Marvellous are thy works,' said the Psalmist, of God Almighty. Why? Because He is greater than His works. But when we have known what God is we know that all His works are done in truth and righteousness.

So is it with man. So was it with Bishop Dunn. We know him from the work he did as Vicar of All Saints, South Acton. That story Mr. Jolliffe knows well and tells it well. It is not the ordinary tale of the parish priest. It is a quite extraordinary narrative of a self-denying consecrated servant of God, making himself the fit instrument for God's hand in a most trying situation. One wonders how he got through all the work and, still more, all the worry.

But he owed much to his home life. Here is a pleasant picture of the home. It was written by the Archbishop of Rupertsland, who had been Dr. Dunn's guest during the meetings of the Pan-Anglican Congress: 'I hope you and yours are very well. I shall never forget the extensive kindness of you all, and I shall ever look back with the pleasantest recollections to my stay at Bishopthorpe. It *was* so nice. I was just remarking to my daughter that the strain of the Synod seemed nothing to me for the reason that I had such a "home" to come to at your house to be *built up* with kindness. I hope that Mrs. Dunn and Miss Dunn are none the worse for all that fell upon them. Remember me most kindly and gratefully to them both, and also to the ever capable Arthur, and to the interesting *smoking* son, who guided me to comfort in the side-room upstairs, where we fumigated together, and where he listened to our "yarns."'

GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY?

We thought we knew most of the things that were as yet to be known about the origin of the

war. But Dr. William Herbert Hobbs, Professor of Geology in the University of Michigan, has discovered things we did not know, and he has set forth all the things that are known in admirable order and clearness in his volume of lectures on *The World War and its Consequences* (Putnam; $2.50 net).

So set forth, these things together form a terrible charge. How the Kaiser, if he is tried, can escape their guilt, it is difficult to see. Professor Hobbs evidently counts him guilty of the Archduke's death. 'On June 12th, a fortnight before the murder of the Archduke, the German Kaiser accompanied by Grand Admiral von Tirpitz, paid a visit to him in his castle at Konopisht in Bohemia. Nothing but rumour is available concerning what passed between them at the meeting, but the Kaiser's remark when the news of the assassination reached him is most significant. So is likewise the fact that the always efficient police force of Sarajevo was instructed by the military authorities not to make any special arrangements for the Archduke's protection, and the military made none themselves. The Archduke rode from the railroad station to the city hall without an escort, and though a bomb was then thrown at him without success and he made protest, he was allowed to drive away from the hall without an escort, and with his wife he was then killed by revolver shots of the assassin Princip.'

'The news of the double murder of the Archduke and his morganatic wife reached the German Emperor at Kiel on board his yacht *Meteor*, where were many guests with him, including Prince Lichnowsky, the German Ambassador to Great Britain. Says Lichnowsky in his memoirs: "His Majesty expressed regret that his efforts to win the Archduke over to his idea had thus been rendered vain. Whether the plan of pursuing an active policy against Serbia had been determined upon at Konopisht, I cannot know. As I was uninformed about views and events at Vienna, I attached no far-reaching importance to this event. Not until later was I able to establish the fact that among the Austrian aristocrats a feeling of relief outweighed all other sentiments. One of His Majesty's other guests on board the *Meteor* was the Austrian Count Felix Thun. Although the weather was splendid, he lay all the time in his cabin suffering from seasickness. When the news arrived, he was well. He had been cured either by the shock or the joy."'

Professor Hobbs is no hot-blooded partisan. Witness his words about Britain's sea-power: 'The fact that Great Britain has not misused her control of the seas to break up the commerce of her neighbours, is no doubt in some measure to be ascribed to the Anglo-Saxon ideals of fair play. It is perhaps quite as much to be explained, however, by the fact that as the one great Power which had adopted the policy of free trade, England had seen no advantage to her national prosperity in ruining her trade rivals, who must also be her customers. Were the seas to fall under the domination of a nation which aims to build up its state upon the destruction of its rivals, there is little reason to doubt that the *mare clausum* in peace times which prevailed in earlier centuries would once more become a *fait accompli*.'

A SHORT HISTORY OF EDUCATION.

Education has at last become popular. Well, it has become popular to talk about education. And when 'society' begins to talk about a thing, get your good book ready, that society may talk less ignorantly and less mischievously. Mr. John William Adamson, Professor of Education in the University of London, is ready with *A Short History of Education* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 12s. 6d. net).

It is a book to read right through. For there is progress. You may dispute about the fact of progress in other lines, talk about its cycles and so forth, as you will; in Education there has been progress unmistakably, and it is best by far to trace its history step by step. Doing so, you see pretty clearly where blunders were made and why, the chief blunder being, as usual, disregard of the actual human nature which had to be educated. And thus you are led on to the wonderful stride made by Thring of Uppingham and his imitators, with whom the history closes.

But you may pick up the book even at an odd half-hour and open it at almost any chapter, with some interest and some profit. In chapter ix. there is a description from Cordier's *Libellus* of 1530 taught at Geneva in the sixteenth century. You will observe how in that school and at that time prayer and performance went together.

'Whilst we are in making an end of our breakfast, the second peal rings, every one takes his books; we go into the common hall. The bills

[*catalogi*, class-rolls] of every form are called, as the custom is; they that are there answer to their name. I make answer too. They that are away are noted by the Monitors in their bills. After the bills have done calling, the master goeth into his pue to pray; he bids us to mind and then he prayeth publicly. When he hath prayed, he saith, Get you every one into his hearing place. They all come together, I also come with my schoolfellows; I sit in my place. The master comes in. He enquires concerning them that are away. And then he sits in his seat and bids the Author's writing to be read up ["jubet pronuntiari auctoris scriptum," orders the passage set from the author in use to be read aloud]. We say three and three [that is, by threes in turn] with a loud voice, as we use to do every day. Then he bids us construe. Some of the more ignorant sort read one by one; we other-some say three and three, and that by heart [*memoriter*] except him that goes orderly [*ordine*, in his turn] before us repeating the very words of the author. At the last, the master exacts the English signification of the words. The better scholars [*doctiores*], to whom he giveth that in charge by name, make answer, I also being commanded by him to answer. He commends them that answer well; of the number of whom (be it spoken without boasting) I was one. Afterwards he commandeth every part of speech to be orderly parsed according to the grammar rule. Last of all, he doth openly appoint what is to be repeated after dinner. When it hath struck eight of clock, he commands us to prayer; which, when it is done, he adviseth us to do diligently what we have to do. At the last he dismisseth us. As he looks upon us, we go forth in order and without noise, and we depart merrily.'

RUHLEBEN.

The name of Ruhleben will be known to every schoolboy in every country, except Germany, for generations to come. And it will be a symbol of man's inhumanity to man. *The History of Ruhleben* has been told by Joseph Powell and Francis Gribble (Collins; 10s. 6d. net). It has been told with great thoroughness and a manifest British determination to be just. Hence it is not the painful reading that one expects it to be. There are episodes and incidents that are painful enough, degradingly painful and diabolically cruel. But there are also acts of consideration and kindness. On the whole the record is black, far too black, but it is not so disgustingly sordid as was feared. Let us quote the authors:

'This part of our story, therefore, ends, as it began, with the exposure of a scandal which Germany will find it difficult to live down. The record of the military authorities at Berlin in the matter, is bad from first to last, though not quite so bad at last as it was at first. They never initiated reforms, and they never quite ceased to obstruct them, passing only by slow degrees from a policy of active cruelty to one of more or less tolerant indifference. Some of their individual subordinates, as has been shown, fought a good fight against them, and succeeded in doing something to save the good name of their country; but even their good will would have accomplished little if it had not been for the help sent from England, and the energy, enterprise, and power of organisation displayed by certain men within the camp. But for these things the death rate would have been appalling, and the whole story of Ruhleben a tragedy. As it was, tragedy was averted and the death rate was kept low. The work which, in the prison camps in England, was done as a matter of course by the military administration, was there left to the resources and initiative of the prisoners themselves. This chapter has shown in what a spirit they grappled with their task.'

The volume is admirably printed and illustrated.

SCOTTISH CLERICAL STORIES.

The Rev. Charles Jerdan, LL.B., D.D., has been best known by his children's sermons. He has published five large volumes of them. And they *are* children's sermons. As one feature of the true children's sermon, they overflow with anecdote. But the anecdotes are so truly children's anecdotes that no one was prepared to find in Dr. Jerdan the Dean Ramsay of a new day. Here he is, however, with an amazingly cheap and an amazingly good collection of *Scottish Clerical Stories and Reminiscences* (Oliphants; 7s. 6d. net).

He has good stories to tell, and he tells them well. They are almost wholly of the ministers of Scotland, and mostly of the ministers of the United Presbyterian Church. They are old and new. But the surprise will be that so many are

new. They are nearly all humorous, for, in spite of the idea which has obtained entrance into the Englishman's head so easily and stays there so tenaciously, the Scotsman's head needs no surgical operation to appreciate a joke. Says Dr. Jerdan: 'There is no more humorous nation in the world than the Scots. Although by no means a demonstrative people, they are full of fun and fond of joking. Their humour is dry—the humour of restraint; but it is natural, spontaneous, and sometimes even unconscious. Occasionally grim, it is seldom boisterous; but, when it is, it shakes the sides with laughter. Often it is *pawky*, that is, sly or arch; and now and then, instead of being pleasantly cheery, it is biting or sarcastic. Take it all in all, this is a peculiar feature of the national character.'

Sometimes the humour is in the situation. The Rev. Alexander Thomson of Haddington had a sermon on Heb. 11^{25}, 'Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.' He preached it 'on a Sacramental Fast Day in Junction Road Church, Leith, of which the Rev. Francis Muir was the much-respected minister. The congregation present on that day was extremely small; and at the close of the service, in the vestry, Mr. Muir said to the preacher: "Thank you very much, Mr. Thomson, for that admirable discourse. I enjoyed it exceedingly. My only regret is that so very few of my people were present to listen to it. It is too painfully evident, Mr. Thomson, that most of the families of the congregation, on a day which ought to be observed with solemnity, have preferred to enjoy the pleasures of sin rather than to *suffer affliction with the people of God*."'

Sometimes the humour is in the language. The same Mr. Thomson had been on holiday and returned unexpectedly. 'When he appeared in the vestibule of the church as the bells were beginning to ring for the morning service, the face of Saunders Porteous, his old elder, and also a noted character in the town, became wreathed with smiles of welcome. "Come awa', Maister Thamson," he shouted, "come awa': the hale congregation 'ill be maist delighted when they see it's yersel' the day." "What's the matter, Saunders? Has the supply not been satisfactory?" "Maister Thamson, if you hadna been here yersel' the day, by next Sawbath they wud hae been a' sperfled, past the poo'er o' man ever to gether them thegether again." "What was wrong, Saunders? Tell me what was wrong." "Maister Thamson, what sort o' a man was yon first ane that you sent us? A perfect mountain-bank, a screeching fule! Yon man canna preach. And then we had Maister C——. We a' ken Maister C——. He was born and brocht up amang us in Heddinton. If there's a godly man walks the earth, it's Maister C——. Nae doot o' that. But, Maister Thamson, God Almichty ne'er intended Maister C—— to gang intil a poopit. He's refuised him gifts: *he* canna preach ony mair than the ither roarin' man. If ye hadna been wi' us yersel' the day, there wud be nae congregation ava next Sawbath."'

The subject of *Clerical Incomes* has at last caught the attention of the public, and it is well to have it thoroughly discussed. The Rev J. Howard B. Masterman, M.A., Canon of Coventry, has edited a volume with that title (Bell; 6s. net). Each chapter relates to a different diocese, and is written by one who knows the condition of affairs in the diocese. The startling and humiliating figures need not be repeated. What remedies are proposed?

The first remedy is a better parson. There are some good parsons already—the first remedy is an increase of their number. The second is a keener sense of responsibility on the part of church members. The third is a more efficient executive. But these remedies take time; what can be done at once? Two suggestions are made—one, more active generosity by Diocesan Boards, the other, bursaries to enable lads of poorer parents to go through a University training and then enter the ministry.

'If I am right in my interpretation of the realities of politics and in my diagnosis of history, then the irresistible conclusion must be that there is only one way of giving us the necessary security and of removing the German peril, and that is to undo the political work of Bismarck, to sever the political bond with Prussia, to disintegrate this formidable and compact German structure—in other words, to substitute a decentralised Germany of small states for the unified and centralised and Prussianised empire.'

That is the central sentence in Dr. Charles

Sarolea's new book, *Europe and the League of Nations* (Bell; 6s. net). He believes in the small nation; he does not believe in the large. Even the confederations which the Peace Conference has blessed—Jugo-Slavia, Checko-Slovakia—he does not believe in. Their heterogeneous elements, he thinks, will never be able to pull harmoniously together. The larger the nationality or confederacy the more unworkable will the League of Nations find it, and Dr. Sarolea is truly anxious to see the League a success. The League of Nations is the Peace Treaty. 'To a superficial observer the Covenant may as yet appear only as an empty form and an elusive shadow. On the contrary, to a thoughtful observer it is the Provisional Treaty which is the shadow. It is the League which is the substance.'

Mr. W. H. V. Reade has written a handy useful book on *The Revolt of Labour against Civilisation* (Blackwell; 3s. net). The danger ahead is in the assertion of mere class selfishness. Me and mine, especially me—it is the return to chaos. How is such a doctrine possible? It is made possible by insistence on the fallacy (or by taking for granted the fallacy) that 'labour' is manual labour, all other labour being idleness; and that the working-man is the man who works with his hands, all other workmen being hangers-on. Says Mr. Reade: 'The whole philosophy of Bolshevism is latent in the cant-words "labour" and "working-man," with their curious implication that outside an area rather vaguely described no one properly can be said to work.'

Mr. George Jeffery, F.S.A., Architect, has written *A Brief Description of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem, and other Christian Churches in the Holy City* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 10s. 6d. net). It is the latest word on a great subject and a great history. A new chapter is opened in the history of Jerusalem, and the Holy Sepulchre will begin a new career of interest and awe. This book is up to date; it brings the whole history up to date; and it describes minutely and most capably the present state of the Holy Sepulchre. There is even a dip into the future.

The most unexpected part of the volume is that which describes the reproductions of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as a Pilgrim Shrine in Europe, the chief of which is the Church of San Stefano in Bologna. 'In England—with the exception of the chapel of the Sepulchre in Winchester Cathedral—very few examples seem to have taken the form of separate buildings or chapels, and but a few parish churches were dedicated in honour of Saint Sepulchre.'

The work is illustrated with plans and other drawings by the author.

The Rev. Charles Reynolds Brown, D.D., LL.D., Dean of the School of Religion in Yale University and Pastor of the University Church, is the right man to invite to address young men. For he is a complete man. The trouble with young men, even when they have just completed their University course, is that they think they are complete men though in fact they are but half-way on the road to completeness. It is only the man who has passed middle life that is complete. He only has had all the experience of manhood and is a man. The young man, having but half the experience yet, counts what he calls 'manliness' manhood. He extols the active virtues, the courageous virtues. When Dr. Brown gives his *Yale Talks* to young men (Humphrey Milford; 4s. 6d. net) he makes contact with their minds by taking the courageous virtues first. But before he is done with them he tells them that there is a place in the complete life for meekness and gentleness, and that he that ruleth his spirit is more than he that taketh a city.

The Power of the Spirit, the new book of the Rev. Percy Dearmer, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical Art in King's College, London, is an appendix to the books which treat systematically of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost (Humphrey Milford; 3s. 6d. net). It is deliberately an appendix. For (this is the Preface and the whole of it)—'In one of the chief text-books of theology used in our theological seminaries, the following references are given by the index: "Holy Ghost, addition of Article on, 198; Divinity of, 199; distinct personality of, 201; history of the doctrine of, 204; procession of, 209; blasphemy against, 446 *seq.*" This seemed to leave room for a little more upon the subject. I therefore ventured to choose "The Power of the Spirit" as the subject for the Page Lectures, at Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Connecticut, this year.'

We get a start when we find Dr. Moffatt's name docked of a letter on the first page, but it is something that the short spelling is maintained throughout, and it is the first and last departure from strict truthfulness. Not another word would we have altered, and not a word would we spare.

First there is a protest against the Holy Ghost being thought of as a giver of consolation. 'Comforter' we call Him, but not in that sense. Dr. Dearmer would have us say 'Paraclete' instead. He quotes the 'Veni Creator' (especially in the Poet Laureate's translation) as expressing the right 'military virtue' of the Holy Spirit. Then he discourses, learnedly and most suggestively, of the Gifts of the Spirit, the Talents of the Spirit, the Fruits of the Spirit.

One of the fruits is Peace. 'A good Christian is never disturbed or fearful, he does not fret or worry. (Oddly enough, as I wrote the last word a telegram arrived which announced that a registered manuscript had taken six days instead of twelve hours to arrive at the publisher's, thus effectually destroying my plans and breaking up my morning's work.) Well, a Christian must never worry, and the gentle "Bother!" is just as much out of place on his lips as the other more pronounced and more theological expletive.'

The Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, Mr. Arthur Gray, tells certain *Tedious Brief Tales of Granta and Gramarye* (Cambridge: Heffer; 4s. 6d. net). They are wild and weird enough for instant credence; for what else but such a life as this could have been lived in the Cambridge of the bad days of yore? The Master tells them well, without approval or disapproval, with just the antiquary's interest. The volume is illustrated by E. Joyce Shillington Scales, and that most charmingly.

Bishop Charles Gore has reissued his *Roman Catholic Claims* (Longmans; 4s. net). This is the eleventh edition. He says of it: 'I have rewritten the account of the early history of the Roman Church (pp. 93–4) in view especially of the investigations of Mr. Edmundson's *Church in Rome in the First Century* (Longmans, 1913), a book, which has not, I think, received sufficient attention.'

Our Lord's ministry in Galilee is the subject of the chapters in the Rev. F. W. Drake's new book, *Galilean Days* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net). 'It is not an analysis, nor a complete record of the work and teaching of Christ in Galilee, nor does it deal in any way with the problem of the sources of the narrative. It is a devotional study of some of the chief events of our Lord's ministry in Galilee, written by one who believes that no humanitarian view of Jesus can meet the demands of the Gospel story, any more than it can satisfy the deepest instincts of the human heart.'

Those who have studied the Benedictus have made a discovery. On the face of it the Song of Zacharias is simply a compilation out of the Old Testament. The phrases are memorable, the thought is prophetic, and that is all. But the study of it, such study as Canon E. A. Burroughs has given to it, is a discovery of strength and wisdom for all time and most of all for the strange time that now is. Canon Burrough's book *The Way of Peace* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net) is an elaborate (but never over-elaborated) exposition of the Benedictus. He quotes one who calls it 'the last prophecy of the Old Testament and the first in the New.' He himself calls it 'the earliest programme of Christian Life.' And it is as a programme of Christian life that he treats it so fully and so helpfully. The central thought is that the way of service is the way of peace.

Sister Agnes Mason of the Community of the Holy Family has been encouraged by her fellow Sisters to write a book on *The Way of Beauty* (Longmans; 5s. net). She hopes 'to shew (1) that there is a distinctive pleasure given by beauty, and to shew in what its difference consists: (2) that beauty is what is commonly called *objective*: (*i.e.*), that there is, with great but more or less accountable variations, a certain agreement or consensus of judgment as to the conditions which things must fulfil in order to be beautiful, and as to the great things which do most perfectly fulfil them: (3) and most important, that Beauty is in the truest and deepest sense *objective*, being of God just as Truth and Righteousness are of God: and certain consequences which follow from this: that is to say, (4) that crimes against beauty are plain sins, just as lying is a sin against truth, and stealing against righteousness; and that our nation is grievously sinning in this way: (5) how, as

beauty flows from God, so it may help us in the way of God, and how we can try to put our children in the way of this help: (6) and lastly, what beauty costs.'

That is an appetizing programme. The book is its fulfilment. Central of all, however, though not directly promised, is the thought of the beauty of God. Yes, He is a beautiful God, and Sister Agnes rejoices in the thought, with a joy that makes her writing itself quite beautiful.

Are all the saints and mystics dead? How careful we are to investigate the right of any man or woman of our own day to be called a saint, how careful to consider the claim to be a mystic. After investigation we find that there are better saints to-day than any that the Church of Rome has canonized; after consideration we discover that there are truer mystics than any previous age of Christianity has left on record. Why should we be astonished at the statement? It ought so to be. It is all a matter of the presence of Christ—its realization and its practice. And it is not to be supposed that Christ should be content to be present to any generation in just the measure in which He was present to the generation before. He is a progressive presence. He records progress. He makes it.

We need not therefore retain the name of mystic for St. John of the Cross and refuse it to Mr. Jesse Brett. *The Hidden Sanctuary* (Longmans; 5s. net) is a volume of 'Devotional Studies.' That is the modern modest title. But it is the old claim to intimacy, and makes the claim good. Moreover it is modern—yes, just because it is modern it is good to read. For we send the half of our faculties to sleep over the ancient mystics, content with a little comfortable pious emotion and forgetting that 'thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy mind.'

Where should one seeking seriously to study the New Testament begin? With the writings of St. Luke. And the Gospel comes before the Acts. For it is the deliberate opinion of the Rev. H. McLachlan, M.A., B.D., Lecturer in Hellenistic Greek in the University of Manchester, that 'the key to New Testament study lies mainly in understanding aright the nature and purpose of Luke's writings.' Mr. McLachlan is right. Textual criticism, historical criticism, exegetical criticism, psychological criticism—all tend to-day to gather round the writings of that man whose nationality, profession, and even personality are so difficult to define.

Mr. McLachlan has written a volume on *St. Luke: The Man and his Work* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). That volume is an introduction to the subject, the best that the serious student can find. There is no problem unvisited or uninvestigated; and the discussion is always marked by candour as well as ability. The linguistic problems are most prominent, but the man himself is always to Mr. McLachlan more than all his writing. He finds Luke himself even in the arrangement of his paragraphs. 'The more the words of Luke are pondered, the clearer becomes the evidence for his possession of a singularly bright spirit. He had a keen sense of the ludicrous. The medley of great things and little, of things mundane and things celestial, of things low and things awful, is plainly shown in the juxtaposition of a parable of the Kingdom with foolish pleas of guests invited to a feast, of the Lord's Prayer with the unwelcome Friend at Midnight, of the thrilling scene at Ephesus and the part played by an ignorant mob, of the lofty address of Paul at Athens and the contemptible newsmongering of the citizens. It is in such contrasts that humour and satire have their place, pointing out an intense, unspeakable incongruity.'

The study of Man is still the most popular study, and we cannot have him old enough. The pursuit of the oldest human being is as keen as the search for the North Pole. And the difficulty is the same at the end. Is this really the oldest, or have we still to look for another? In his manual entitled *An Introduction to Anthropology* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net), the Rev. E. O. James, B.Litt., F.C.S., writes the history of the Neanderthal and all other types of prehistoric man, including the Grimaldi Race, discovered at Mentone and called after the Prince of Monaco, and a fine exciting history it is. The latest sensation is the Ipswich skeleton, discovered in 1911, but now, alas, admitted by its discoverer to be of quite moderate antiquity. The book is an Introduction to the whole science of Anthropology. Mr. James is one of the most enthusiastic of its students. His manual is up to date and excellent.

The Rev. E. F. Braley, M.A., LL.M., Organizer of Religious Education in the Diocese of Southwell, has written a book on the religious education of the adolescent, and called it *Sir Hobbard de Hoy* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). It is really a book on the Bible Class—the first great book written on that great subject. Mr. Braley knows all about the Bible Class and has great faith in its possibilities. But it must be recognized, prepared for, taught, nursed, and nourished. Let not any Bible Class teacher go on teaching without reading this book. If the class is doing ill it will then do well, if it is doing well it will do better.

The Testing of a Nation (Macmillan; 6s. net) is the title which the Archbishop of Canterbury has given to the collected volume of his war sermons and addresses. In a true sense they are a history of the war, for they are a history of our public religion. This is what we felt about God and duty, interpreted for us by a man of true discernment. And it is comforting now to see that we were neither revengeful nor afraid. Dr. Davidson never said that we were sure to win—he left that to the prophets among our generals. But he said that we were in God's hands, and if we would but be true to the knowledge of God given to us, whatever the issue it would be well with us. Faith and courage—those are the notes that recur quite steadily throughout the volume.

Sir James George Frazer owes his reputation to his scholarship and his style. When scholarship and style are found together and in such measure of excellence as in him, the combination is irresistible. For if it is Frenchmen who can write well, it is Englishmen who can enjoy good writing; and if it is Germans that can investigate, it is Scotsmen that can appreciate the investigation. In his 'Golden Bough,' Sir James Frazer is the scholar first; in his *Sir Roger de Coverley, and other Literary Pieces* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net), the first charm is the purity of the English idiom. Never has Addison had a more loyal lover. The story of the visit to Coverley Hall was first told in the Introduction to a selection of Addison's Essays. It is now magnified, literally and metaphorically, by the publication of four papers discovered among the manuscripts still preserved in the Hall. They are delightful papers, quite worthy of a place in the *Spectator*, which they may only accidentally have missed.

The other papers are a children's tale, 'The Quest of the Gorgon's Head,' four biographical sketches (Cowper, Robertson Smith, Fison, and Howitt), and fifteen shorter essays.

What is the theme of the Second Epistle to Timothy? The Rev. Harrington C. Lees says *The Promise of Life*. And under that title he has published an exposition of the Epistle in a series of Keswick addresses (Morgan & Scott; 3s. net). Mr. Lees was born to be an expositor, and he has made good his birthright by hard study. It is in the original language of the Epistle that he makes his discoveries, and then it is with a fine sense of idiomatic English that he makes them ours. His titles are: 'The Music of Memory,' 'The Securities of Faith,' 'The Heroism of Faith,' 'The Cost of Favour,' 'The Secret of Staying Power,' and 'Facing the Facts of life.'

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have published a new and revised edition of the Rev. W. Y. Fullerton's book on *The Practice of Christ's Presence* (2s. 6d. net).

The Church We Forget, by the Rev. P. Whitwell Wilson (Morgan & Scott; 7s. 6d. net), is 'a Study of the Life and Words of the Early Christians' by an evangelist for evangelists. Mr. Wilson is interested not so much in the things that befell St. Paul or any other of the early Christians, as in the use that can be made of them for the propagation of the Gospel. His scholarship is supplemented by his enthusiasm. If he is unconcerned about the great problems of the Acts, he is much concerned about the Gospel according to St. Paul. His historical allusions may need revision, but they never fail of their application. 'Paul,' he says, 'made friends in one place, only to tear himself from them. Repeatedly, as he was settling down, the call came to move elsewhere. Little need we wonder if he yearned for an abiding city, the place prepared for him, where he might be seated happily, with the Saviour Whom he loved. Yet as a figure in history—hunted, persecuted, maltreated—he was an utter contrast to the wandering Jew of poetry and drama. Shylock, dreaming of his ducats, is pitifully a smaller man than Paul, who being of the same race as Shylock, of the same education, the same tenacious obduracy, dreamed of an inherit-

ance, incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven—note the exquisitely unselfish touch—not "for me" but "for you"—for others than himself."

Dr. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament in the Western Theological Seminary, is one of the most enthusiastic teachers of our time. He is well furnished and he is practical. His volume on *The Book of Genesis* for Bible Classes and Private Study has no nonsense whatever about it. He tells you in it what books to have beside you, and then how to use them. He teaches, he catechizes, he sets you essays to write. Messrs. Mowbray are the British publishers ($1.25 net).

To his 'Biblical and Oriental Series,' Professor Mercer has added two volumes—the one on *Religious and Moral Ideas in Babylonia and Assyria*, the other on the *Growth of Religious and Moral Ideas in Egypt* (Mowbray; $1.50 each).

Dr. Mercer sees what he wants done and does it. This series is unrivalled for the purpose of introducing the educated but inexpert reader to the Comparative Study of Religion. One religion at a time is the best method.

Sir Francis Darwin's new volume of essays, which he calls *Springtime* (Murray; 7s. 6d. net), is quite as light and airy as the first was. Flowers have the best share, as is right and proper. But pleasant things are said about the names of characters in fiction, extracts are made from the voluminous diaries of Thomas Hearne, and there are recollections or sketches of Sir Joseph Hooker, Sir George Airy, Sydney Smith, and Charles Dickens. The best of all is an essay on 'Old Instruments of Music.' It is full of curious captivating information, and it is effectively illustrated. The puzzled Bible reader will find a picture as well as a description of shawms and sackbuts. The name 'shawm,' says Sir Francis, 'is believed to be derived from *calamaula*, a reed-pipe, which was corrupted to *chalem-elle*, and then to *shawm*. Shawms were made of various sizes, from the small treble instrument, one foot long, to the huge affair, six feet in length. The name Howe-boie, *i.e.* probably Haut-bois, was applied to the treble instrument as early as the reign of Elizabeth; while the deeper-toned instruments retained the name shawm.'

Quite a number of the persons who come into the Gospel story are—worse than Melchizedek for he had a name—nameless. Miss Hilda Parham finds one for every day of every week in Lent. One of them is the little child whom Jesus took and 'set in the midst.' We pass on to Miss Parham the interesting suggestion made in this magazine last month that he was Peter's son and that his name was Simon. Miss Parham gives two or three pages to each of them. The title is *Nameless Notables of the Gospel* (Skeffington; 3s. 6d. net).

The Rev. E. W. Barnes, Sc.D., F.R.S., Canon of Westminster, has written a judicious little book on *Spiritualism and the Christian Faith* (S.C.M.; 1s. net).

To make the Old Testament ours again, and ours with all the gain those years of study have brought—that is a task worthy a strong man's adventure. The Rev. Hugh Martin has attempted it. And he has not failed. The book is small but it is well filled. The title is *The Meaning of the Old Testament according to Modern Scholarship* (S.C.M.; 4s. net).

The Student Christian Movement is not to be accused of goody goodiness. The publication of the Rev. John Bretherton's book on *The Purpose of Prayer* (6s. net) is enough to answer the accusation. The problems of prayer are all discussed in it. And the conclusions are not all orthodox or ordinary. Nor are the illustrations. 'In connection with the founding of Carthage the story is told how that Dido, requesting a site for the city, was assured that as much land would be given as could be encircled by an ox's hide. It was intended that only a restricted space of a few yards should be given, but the hide was cut into thin strips, and formed into one long cord, which enclosed sufficient ground to build the first city upon. And when we seek material gifts from God we can be sure that He would rather we ask according to the larger measurement than the smaller.

> Large petitions we would bring,
> We are coming to a King;
> And His grace and power are such,
> None can ever ask too much.'

That Friend of Mine is the title of a biography

of Marguerite McArthur by Josephine Kellett (Swarthmore Press; 7s. 6d. net). Marguerite McArthur died in her twenty-sixth year, yet she had had a full life. 'She had seen and heard most of what was fine in modern life. She had heard the greatest musicians in Montreal and London and Dresden; she had seen the best operas and the most famous actors; she had learned to love the best in art, in the galleries of Dresden, Paris, New York and London. Above all, she knew, as one of her soldier-pupils afterwards said, almost everything that is good and beautiful and true in literature. In sport she had seen the big matches in most games, the best skaters, the most exciting boat-races. She had thrilled to the grandest scenes in Nature, and, in her work for the First Seven Divisions, as well as later in France, she had felt the exaltation and pride of knowing all that was finest and bravest and best in humanity. She was ready for the new life: not its semblance, but itself.'

She was gifted beyond most, even beyond those whose gifts are manifest. Health of body was hers, soundness of mind, spiritual apprehension. She was a keen sportswoman, a diligent and successful student, a good friend and even with her years a safe guide in life. The soldiers to whom she ministered so pleasantly and so untiringly in Etaples adored her, and were deeply moved by her unexpected death. She died of pneumonia after the war had ended.

It is a book for young girls beyond all other persons and almost beyond all other books, so enterprising is it, so healthy, so right.

'Definitions,' says Mr. Watts-Dunton in his article on 'Poetry' in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 'are for the most part alike unsatisfactory and treacherous; but definitions of poetry are proverbially so.' Yet Mr. George O'Neill, S.J., M.A., Professor of English Language in University College, Dublin, defines poetry. 'Poetry,' he says, 'is the language of passion and imagination expressing themselves under control of the laws of beauty.' And having defined it so, he defends his definition, first by taking its phrases one by one and expounding them, next by giving examples of poetry and commending them, and finally by giving examples of 'the reverse' and condemning them. All this in the first of the essays which make up a pleasantly readable volume, entitled *Essays on Poetry* (Dublin: Talbot Press; 5s. net). The rest of the essays deal with poets—Aubrey de Vere, William Allingham, Thomas Boyd, and Gerard Hopkins—all Irish, all half forgotten, all unforgettable. Take for recollection this from Gerard Hopkins's strange piece entitled: 'That Nature is a Heracleitean Fire and of the comfort of the Resurrection.'

Enough! the Resurrection
A heart's clarion! Away grief's gasping joyless days, defection,
Across my foundering deck shone
A beacon, an eternal beam. Flesh fade and mortal trash
Fall to the residuary worm; world's wildfire, leave but ash;
In a flash, but a trumpet-crash,
I am all at once what Christ is, since he was what I am.

The fragments of manuscripts found so long ago by Dr. Schechter in the Cairo Genizah are still being published. The Jewish Theological Seminary of America has added a volume of them to their 'Texts and Studies.' It forms No. 6 of that Series. The editor is Dr. Israel Davidson, Professor of Mediæval Hebrew Literature in the Seminary. The title is *Mahzor Yannai*. In addition to the Notes which, like the work itself, are in Hebrew, there is a long and informing Introduction. In the Preface Dr. Davidson says: 'The texts, edited for the first time in this volume, represent the remains of a large work of religious poetry, composed for every Sabbath of the year and grouped about the weekly portions of the Pentateuch, according to the divisions of the Triennial Cycle. The importance of these compositions for the history of mediæval Jewish liturgy lies not only in their being the residue of a work lost for many centuries and up to recent times entirely unknown, but also in the fact, that through them we are able to get a clearer idea of the rise and the development of the liturgical poetry known as Piyyut. Yannai, the author of these religious poems, flourished in the seventh century and is, therefore, next to Yose ben Yose, the oldest Payyetan. He is also reputed to have been the teacher of Kalir, the best known of all mediæval liturgists.'

Quality in Life (Watkins; 3s. 6d.) is a good title for a volume of essays, and the essays are as good as the title. They are thoughtful and suggestive of further thought, and they are expressed in faultless English with an occasional arresting illustration. The short essay on 'The Growth of Sensibility' is particularly incentive of thought. 'We are not children, but let us always cleave to our child nature; let us hold fast our day-dreams; let us treasure our sense of wonder in the universe; let us cherish in all its freshness the child faculty of hospitality to those flashes of wisdom and feeling which are too wayward in their coming and going, and of too delicate a nature, to pierce the adamantine crust with which habit and convention, if we watch not, will imprison what should be a free and ever-enlarging life.'

Dr. Arthur Keith comes nearest in our generation to the Huxley of last generation in the power to popularize the results of Science without loss of those results. He has Huxley's knowledge of human nature, more than Huxley's knowledge of scientific fact, and almost all Huxley's enviable gift of exposition. Who will forget his first reading of the book entitled 'The Antiquity of Man'? Its wonderful tree of evolution, a great work of science and art combined, is a possession for ever.

Dr. Keith, who is the Hunterian Professor in the Royal College of Surgeons and the Conservator of the Museum, has written already on 'The Human Body,' and so lucidly, learnedly, and reverently that, however we may be troubled by the thought of the way the body has come in the course of the millenniums, it is impossible for us to do other than regard it with awe, so fearfully and wonderfully has it been 'shaped in the lowest parts of the earth.' Now he has added to our debt in that respect by a volume on *The Engines of the Human Body* (Williams & Norgate; 12s. 6d. net) in which he describes its parts and their functions as lucidly, learnedly, and reverently as before, and just as memorably.

The Practice of the Spiritual Life.

By Professor the Reverend Hugh Ross Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.D.,
New College, Edinburgh.

There is always a danger of supposing that some magic formula, some new crystal phrase, if only we could discover it, would solve all difficulties of the Christian life. Just as at the moment people are looking round for a panacea to cure the Church's ills, and suggesting that it may be found in better Biblical criticism or none at all, enthusiasm for social reform or quietistic renunciation of social interest, more ornate or more simple worship—so also it is with the individual. People wonder whether the remedy for mischiefs, personal or corporate, may not lie in some novel, mysterious idea; 'if only,' as the old preacher said, 'it would occur.' In point of fact, however, the sources of Christian goodness are known, and have been long open. They are as familiar and as great as the perennial themes of poetry—Nature, Love, the conflict of good and evil in human life. We Christians need not hunt about for the secret; it is an open secret. Our sufficiency is of God. Jesus said, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,' and in that said everything. Not more knowledge is wanted, but a better will. God is *there* for us in Christ; the only question is, Shall we take Him in? The cure for our ills, social and personal, is just to be better Christians.

Again, we can have Spiritual Life if we long to have it. I recall an address by Dr. John R. Mott, in which the refrain came at intervals, like a strong hammer-stroke: 'You can be holy if you wish to be holy.' Not that there is anything automatic in religion. But there is the promise of God to faith, and His promises get themselves fulfilled.

In the Spiritual Life, we need the true *inwardness* and the true *outwardness*. There is reception, and there is expression. Probably most people have always been in agreement about reception, about the ways in which we are given the life of

God. But they differ a good deal about expression, which is a serious thing. The ways in which we express the received Divine life undoubtedly react on the very presence and power of that life within us. Strip its leaves from a plant, and you may kill it; and give personal Christianity its wrong expression in the life we live alongside of others, or fail to give it the right one, and the consequences may be grave.

I.

As to reception, the great believers by their experience have fixed one or two principles. They have marked down one or two sources of Spiritual Life as indispensable. Let us glance at these.

1. The Word of God.—There was an old saint who said that in former days he used to pray first, then read his Scripture portion, but he had learnt better and changed the order. He was right: Scripture, the vehicle of the gospel, must always come first; in it God takes the initiative, and our faith or prayer is a response. On the drill-ground the opening word always is, 'Attention!' and the Bible calls us to order at the outset of devotion. 'I will hear what God the Lord will speak' is the attitude faith takes to God, and it is in His Word, pre-eminently and unfailingly, that He does speak. If this reading of God's message is to be fruitful and serious, it must be daily. There was an advantage in the old days in being 'masters of one book'; that strength we may recapture, for inquiry has made the Book more intelligible and more interesting than ever.

What shall we read in the Bible? people say. First, Read what feeds your soul: which means that as you get older, new and before unappreciated portions of the Bible will disclose their value. Certain parts probably will come to no harm if you leave them alone altogether. But let first things be first: make the Psalms and the Gospels central.

Second, How much ought one to read at a time? Where shall we stop? No man can make rules for his neighbour, but a counsel (not wholly original) may be ventured. Read on until you reach a verse where, if it be night-time, you can lay your head right down as on a pillow; or which, if it be morning, you can take in your hand as a staff to lean on for the day's march.

Third, Occasionally read a book of the Bible right through at a sitting. When Dr. Moffatt's translation of the New Testament came in, I sat down and read 'Philippians' from start to finish. How it freshened the whole to get the beautiful familiar letter in a new dress and in a single swift impression!

We may take it that the Word of God is so essential that to speak of strong Spiritual Life apart from its constant use is folly. Some things experience does prove, this amongst them. Many new discoveries are being, and will be, made; but no one has yet found out how to nourish the body without food, and in the Bible is the spirit's food.

2. Prayer.—If we breathe in God's redeeming truth by laying our heart open to His Word, with its nutrient properties, we breathe out the heart to Him in prayer. We speak in prayer, and we listen; listening is an element in prayer the importance of which we too much ignore. He who is never silent before God, listening in perfect stillness, cannot grow. Often the truth God tells us as we read the Bible, He repeats and seals as we pray.

The inconceivable worth of prayer for Spiritual Life—this is not argument, it is Christian history. A reading of the great missionary lives is proof enough: Brainerd, Martyn, Livingstone, Coillard, we know whence they drew their power to set back the frontiers of darkness and let the light shine. Just as the arm of the electric street-car goes up and presses close against the live wire, and the car lies helpless and inert when contact is broken, so these men were weak apart from prayer. And to adduce the Name above every name, Jesus is our forerunner in this field. He is not the Saviour merely; just because He is Saviour He is also the great Believer. As we look at Him in the Gospels we can see that He was 'the first that ever burst' into that great unexplored ocean of the Father's love and realized power to help. It was through prayer He got the good of that Love. He prayed by day and by night; with long petitions and with short; in the solitary mountains and in the crowded streets and lanes. Christ loved prayer and practised it.

Nor must it be forgotten that prayer does men good only when they seek God for His own sake. All prayer that can be called prayer is uttered in the attitude of *adoration*; the man who prays squinting at his own moral improvement defeats himself. That way lies self-consciousness. The object of prayer at its highest is not our success or felicity or holiness, but communion with God just

for Himself. In the Lord's Prayer, God's glory and Kingdom take precedence of petitions for personal blessing. No man ever yet fell in love in order to improve his character, nor would his character gain that way; and if fellowship with God is to make us good, in the Bible sense of goodness, it must be because He is more to us than all His gifts.

Mr. Oldham has said that when we think of prayer, we at once think of its limitations; when Jesus thinks of prayer, it is as crowded with unimaginable possibilities. There is nothing worth doing which it cannot do. Is not this specially true of 'ejaculatory' prayer? No better saint has been in this country for long than Dr. Andrew Bonar, and in his journal he writes: 'I find that unless I keep up short prayer throughout the day, at intervals, I lose the very spirit of prayer.' Nothing could be more *natural* than such a habit; when staying with a friend, we do not speak to him at length before breakfast and after supper, carefully refraining from conversation in between. We remember that our friend is there, and we talk to him. There are many times, indeed, when nothing but sudden prayer will serve; moments of temptation, of perplexity, of the thrill of gratitude. Here too we have the pattern of our Lord. As He healed the deaf and dumb man, as He hung on the Cross dying in the dark, He prayed brief dart-like prayers. That should be enough for us. Let us not be like the child who said: 'I didn't know you could say your prayers except of an evening.'

Do you pray? Even in this Convention one may safely put the question. Looking back over a week, can you see points at which you consciously placed yourself before God and took from Him the needed power? Were there moments at which you laid hold of Him, and said something real, were it only '*my God*'? Do not be put off by fear that you cannot pray for long periods. Probably you can't: very few people can. But we can take ourselves aside and see God's face. We can stretch our hands through the veil of sense and lay hold on the Unseen Love. We can have a little chapel, with an ever-burning light, where we kneel and receive.

How would our souls stand up, O Lord,
Erect and strong and free,
If we but knew the ample hoard
Of wealth we have in Thee!

We do not need to sway Thy mood,
Nor beg of Thee to hear;
Ere our own mind has understood,
Expectant is Thine ear.

3. Thinking about Christ.—Not that we are asked to think about Christ all the time; that is neither possible nor desirable. A student writing against time in an examination; a surgeon at a critical moment in an operation; a taxi-driver threading a crowded thoroughfare—their duty is to keep a mind concentrated on the task nearest them and not suffer their attention to wander for even a second, even to Christ. God knows this: it is He who has chosen these absorbing duties and sent us out to them. All the more reason we should use the leisure times that do occur to think about Jesus Christ in a natural and simple way. It can be done, for example, as we move along the street. An acquaintance once saw Dr. Chalmers, in Edinburgh, as he came down the Mound, his head sunk on his breast, deep in thought; watching him, he crossed the street and laid his hand upon his sleeve. And Chalmers looked up, like one coming out of a trance, saying: 'That's a glorious verse—"My God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus."' Out of the heart's fulness the mouth spoke.

How much easier the Christian life would prove, if only we thought of Jesus Christ oftener! If we had a dear friend in Australia, and never gave him a thought, he would even cease to be dear, and presently it would be all one as though he were dead. We are what we think about. The nation that is constantly dreaming of war, keeping its mind on the subject, goes war-mad; the man who keeps his mind on Jesus grows keen on all things for which Jesus stands. We abide in Christ by means of our thinking. Thought is the opening through which pour the waters of His great life, to flood the shallows of our poor nature.

To think of Christ is to enjoy His friendship, and can we set limits to what that friendship will do for us? It is an intimacy to enrich mind and heart. No one ever dreamt such dreams for mankind as Jesus, and we can listen as He speaks about them. No one ever so realized the supremacy of God's will, or so dwelt under its shadow; He can lead us also into that experience. No one knew so deeply that love means sacrifice; that lesson too He can instil into our narrow hearts. Will

not this companionship, this effort, through His Spirit, to enter into His mind and taste its blessedness and delight—will it not make us different? Will it not bring us out of ourselves, therefore, from gloom into joy? Yes, it will. The indolent, the cold, the covetous—He can change them all.

Clearly we make progress only as we look out—away from ourselves. Not self-inspection is the secret, but Faith. As Forbes Robinson put it in a wise word: 'I have never found it profitable to meditate on my sins.' Looking up is so much better than looking in. That is why Faith makes a man stronger in character: it takes his mind off himself and fixes it on Another. So he ceases to brood over failures or successes, and is changed by beholding. We escape from evil by thinking on what is good, and Christ is the best of all.

II.

For a true full Spiritual Life reception must be accompanied by expression.

1. Obedience.—Channels for the inflowing of the Divine life can be kept clear only by obedience. The Christian is a man who does as Christ bids him. 'My Master has said such and such, and that is enough for me.' Have we ever taken this quite seriously—this duty to obey Christ? Probably each of us has some corner of life unreclaimed, unchristianized—our temper, our imagination, the way we make our income, our expenditure. We will *not* let Christ rule over that. For one case of perplexity as what Christ's will is there are ten or a hundred cases of refusal to obey the will He has made quite plain.

Are you doing your best to keep His commandments? Remember this will react powerfully on your inner life: your fidelity to Him as Master affects your assurance that He is Saviour. To-day one of His commands is troubling many people. He bids us forgive our enemies. It is quite possible that God's hearing of prayer for Revival is going to depend on whether we are ready to forgive Germany. We know what Jesus said as He hung upon the Cross: 'Forgive them, for they know not what they do.' Shall we contend that we have more unpardonable injuries to forgive than He?

2. Justice and love of our neighbour.—Our idea of saint is changing. The old mystic idea of *solus cum solo* is not false, but if put forward as complete it is thoroughly unsound. A certain colour-blindness for definite parts of the Bible—such as the social teaching of the prophets and of Christ—has hid the fact that if we are to be saints, the people of God, we must rectify our relations to our neighbour. Note our Lord's answer to the question which was the greatest commandment. He began: 'Thou shalt love the Lord'—which will always be primary and central and the fertile root of everything. But He did not stop there. He said there was a second like the first: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'

Therefore the saint must be a social reformer—in purpose, in sympathy—or he will not be a saint in Jesus' sense. Holiness means zeal for righteousness. If you are going to be Christlike in this sphere, which is it to be?—social reform an unpleasant necessity, lest worse should come, or social reform welcomed as the good will of God? We may find an analogy in slavery. If we discovered that an acquaintance of ours still held slaves—in Africa, let us say—we should be sure of one thing, that he was not a good man. Once a slave-holder *might* be a Christian; we remember John Newton's statement that he had never had sweeter communion with God than on the deck of his slave-ship. Yet now as we look back, we say, 'They were good men, they were in fellowship with God; *but how could they do it?*' So when Christians look back a hundred years hence, on the Church of this generation, and mark the indifference to bad housing, sweated labour, intemperance, they too will say: 'They were good people, they were in fellowship with God; *but how could they do it?*' The idea of saint is changing, and it will change yet more. Mazzini, the Italian patriot, once said: 'When I hear a man called good, I ask, "Who then has he saved?"' Of more and more people within the Church it will be true that they have to catch this tide of concern for their neighbours' lives, or the great Divine movement will leave them high and dry. Their spiritual life will pay for their blindness to God's will.

How am I to know whether I am making headway in the Spiritual Life? Here is a possible touchstone. Is Christ greater to me than ever? Is my sense of *wonder* growing? Wonder at the love of God, wonder that we are His, wonder at God's passion in the Cross, at the infinite prospect of immortality? When Jacob Boehme lay dying,

at the last he raised himself from the bed and cried, 'Open the window, and let in more of that music!' That is where we want to live; with the music about us of God's unconquerable love in Christ. If something more of its marvel is taking possession of us, let us give thanks. 'O Lord, I am thy servant, truly I am thy servant; thou hast loosed my bonds.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

I.

'One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren.'—Mt 23^8.

Last century, perhaps about the time your grandfather was a boy, there were, here and there throughout the country, homes in which boys and girls could not have helped feeling that they dared not be rough or make a great noise.

I want to tell you about one such home in the town of Scarborough in Yorkshire. The father had died, and the mother was left to take care of five young children, four girls and one boy whose name was Joshua. The mother was a very gentle woman with a face that would have made you love her. She wore her hair brushed smoothly down under a close-fitting muslin cap which had no ribbons upon it. Round her neck, and under her black bodice, there was always a snow-white neckerchief, and on occasions a black silk or cashmere shawl was pinned over her shoulders.

When her children were quite little she was often an invalid, for her husband's death had been a great blow to her: she had loved him with her whole heart. But she was always able to speak to her little girls and Joshua about the poor and the suffering, and she did it in such a way that her words seemed to them like God's words.

Joshua, about whom I want to speak to you, was born on April 6, 1844. He and his sisters did not go to school at first; they were taught by a governess. When they went out, they walked on the streets with a feeling that somehow they were not like other boys and girls. It was a common thing for them to hear the street children calling 'Quack, quack, quack!' and they knew what that meant. If it had not been for the thought of their happy though quiet home, and their mother's love and teaching, I believe Joshua would have turned his head and said things back again. Not very long ago a Sunday School teacher was speaking to a class of boys about forgiving one's brother 'until seventy times seven.' 'What,' she asked, 'would be gained by doing such a thing?'

'Nothing,' came the answer from one boy.

'Then, what would *you* do if any one kept calling you names?' she asked him.

'I would tell the fellow to stop once, twice—maybe three times, and if he still went on, I would give him a thrashing.'

Joshua had been trained by his mother to believe in the New Testament way, for she was a Quaker. If you have not heard of the Quakers before now, ask your father or mother to tell you a little about them, and then get the *Life of George Fox* out of the Library and read it.

Joshua's surname was Rowntree. The name will suggest something nice to many of you. But he did not, like some of his relatives, grow up to make cocoa or chocolate. He became a lawyer. Walking with a schoolboy cousin one day his mother said, 'My dearest wish for Joshua is that he may become a leader of men both in his town and country; for there is nothing more noble, nothing which brings more happiness in life than to help others to do the right.' And as a lawyer Joshua Rowntree lived to fulfil that wish.

He loved his fellow-men, especially the hard-working thousands of the great cities. There were in Scarborough many lads who had neglected their education when they were boys. Joshua had heard of schools having been started for the benefit of such lads — schools that were like Scripture classes. Why should he not start one in his native town? If the lads would only have confidence in him, and ask questions about anything they did not understand, they and he might be a help to each other.

The motto of Joshua Rowntree's Adult School was at first, 'They helped every one his neighbour, and every one said to his brother, "Be of good courage."' Later the words from the New Testament were added, 'One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren.' In teaching and speaking he took, as far as possible, the standpoint of the men themselves. It was as if he talked like a child to a child, just as a good mother does to her little children.

'One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren.' Joshua Rowntree was following the example of Jesus Christ in trying to be a true brother to the men amongst whom he worked. Besides trying to teach them, he made a strong effort to interest them in Temperance, for he realized the evil done by the use of strong drink. Then he talked to them about politics. He had always been a keen politician himself—one of the right kind. He did not argue as if his side were right and that of every one else wrong, and in every discussion he took part he invariably took up the defence of the weak and the wronged. Joshua Rowntree, the little Quaker boy, whom the street boys of Scarborough derided, lived to be a blessing to those about him. He was for some time a respected and beloved member of Parliament. Referring to a letter which Joshua had written regarding a question on which he felt very strongly, the Colonial Secretary said, 'That was real Christianity.' So you see he preached the gospel of Jesus Christ wherever he went.

His presence anywhere seemed to bring a wonderful influence with it. He was for some time a magistrate and used to sit upon the Bench. He was always just, but even when he pronounced sentence, it was evident that he loved the poor erring ones. A young girl, who had done wrong and stood before him as a criminal, said afterwards, 'To go before Joshua Rowntree on the Bench made you feel you might be a good woman.'

II.

The Compleat Angler.

'They set a trap, they catch men.'—Jer 5^{26}.

'Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men.'—Lk 5^{10}.

There is a curious fish which inhabits the waters near our coasts. It is called the angler fish, and it has received this name because of the strange way in which it attracts its prey.

The angler fish is generally about three feet in length, and the greater part of its body is made up of its head! Its mouth is a huge chasm containing two long rows of very sharp teeth. But the extraordinary bit about this creature is its back fin. Three of the rays or spines belonging to this fin have grown into long tentacles and have removed from the back to the head. These tentacles the angler fish uses as baits to catch the smaller fishes. When it is ready for a meal it hides its head in the mud or among the sea-weed and waves the tentacles about in the water. They look exactly like three nice tempting worms, and the front ray, which is clubbed at the end, appears specially attractive. Very soon up swims a small fish expecting a nice dinner. Of course it never sees the huge mouth, for not even the silliest of silly little fishes would walk open-eyed into that trap. But just when it is upon the point of seizing the supposed worm there is a vicious snap, and the poor little victim is engulfed in the vast cavern.

The sailors sometimes call the angler fish the 'sea-devil,' and don't you think it is a good name? For when the devil wants to get hold of a man or a woman, when he wants to capture a boy or a girl he doesn't do it openly: he sets a trap. He knows that if his intended victims saw what an ugly, cruel, horrible old wretch he was he would never catch them at all, so he hides himself and dangles an attractive bait in front of their eyes.

That is why the things that lead us astray often seem so nice. We are so taken up looking at the attractive side of them that we forget where they are leading us until we find that we have wandered far away from the things that we knew to be right and true.

There is one other thing I want you to think about. You and I, boys and girls, whether we know it or not, are angling either on the side of Jesus or on the side of the devil.

Our first text was addressed to the people of Judah and Israel. They were told that among them were wicked men who set a trap and caught men. These wicked men were really servants of Satan. They caught others to destroy them.

Our second text is taken from the story of the miraculous draught of fishes. You remember how Jesus stood one morning by the shores of the Lake of Gennesaret, and He saw two fishing-boats lying there, but the fishermen had gone out of

them and were washing their nets a little distance off. He entered one of the boats and told the owners to launch out into the deep and let down their net for a draught. The skipper, Simon Peter, replied that they had toiled all night and caught nothing, but nevertheless because Jesus told them to do it they would let down the net. And when they obeyed they enclosed such a multitude of fishes that their net broke and they had to call in the help of their partners in the other ship. Not only that, but so great was the weight of their catch that both ships began to sink.

When Peter saw it he fell down at Jesus' feet and cried, 'Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' And Jesus said, 'Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men.'

If you looked up that word 'catch' in the Greek New Testament you would see that it means 'take alive' or 'save alive.' That is what Jesus is doing, and that is what His true followers are doing too by His help.

For, boys and girls, if you are not on Jesus' side, if you are not on the side of the things that are noble and right, then, consciously or unconsciously, you are helping to draw others into the devil's trap. But if you are faithfully trying to follow Jesus and to do what He would have you do, then by your influence and example, by your kind words and your loving deeds, you are helping to catch men alive that they may be filled with fuller life.

III.

Our Great Example.

'I have given you an example.'—John 13^{15}.

Our text to-day is one of Christ's sayings. He said it to His disciples the last evening He was on earth, just before they all had their last meal together.

You remember that Last Supper. It was held in a large upper room lent by one of Christ's friends. Now, before a meal, what seems to us a curious performance was gone through. All the guests had their feet bathed. This was absolutely necessary for their comfort because the people wore no shoes in the house and only sandals out-of-doors, and the sandy roads of Palestine were both hot and dusty. So the custom was that when the guests arrived a slave poured cool water over their tired feet and wiped them with a towel. Christ and His disciples were poor and had no slave to perform this office for them, but one of the disciples was supposed to do it instead.

On this last evening of Christ's life, however, the disciples had been quarrelling as to which of them was the greatest, and they had got so hot over it that they hustled into the room like a lot of great sulking schoolboys. They threw themselves down on their couches and looked at the table, looked at the ceiling, looked at the floor, looked everywhere but at the pitcher and basin and towel that were crying out to be used. They knew quite well that it was the duty of one to bathe the feet of the others, but they were all equally determined not to be that one. They thought that he who would condescend to do such a lowly service would at once be acknowledging himself inferior, so they just sat and gloomed and said nothing.

Neither did Christ say anything; but He did something. He did a most surprising thing. He took a look at their faces and He took a look at their hearts—for He saw all that was going on there—and then He rose, and, casting aside His robes, took the pitcher and the basin and the towel, and one after another He washed the feet of those sullen angry men. Can't you guess how they must have felt when their Lord and Master—the Lord and Master of heaven and earth—stooped to do for them a slave's duty? In one moment the angry passion must have left each heart, and burning shame must have filled it.

We know that Peter, who was always the spokesman, did protest, and that he drew up his feet on the couch, and refused to let Christ serve him. But Christ insisted that Peter also should have his feet bathed. He bathed the feet of all, even those of Judas, who that very night was to betray Him for the price of a slave.

Then Christ put on His robes again and sat down, and, looking on their shamed faces, said gently, 'Do you know why I, your Lord and Master, have done this? It is because I want you to do likewise. I have given you an example, and I want you to think of it and copy it when I am gone. I want you to learn that true greatness consists in serving others, and that the greatest among you is the one who is readiest to serve his brethren!'

Now, when Christ said He had given us an

example to copy, He did not mean that we were actually to take a pitcher and a basin and a towel and go around washing the feet of others. Emperors and Popes and Archbishops have done that and are still doing it every year on Holy Thursday—or Maundy Thursday as we call it—the day before Good Friday. I am sure you will all have heard of Maundy money or Maundy pennies, the little silver pieces that our own King gives to deserving poor people on that day. He gives them money now instead of washing their feet, for the last English sovereign to carry out the ceremony of feet-washing was James II.

To wash the feet of beggars or poor people—that is one way of copying Christ's example. It is copying it in the letter. But that is not the way Christ meant us to copy it when He said, 'I have given you an example.' He meant us to take the spirit in which the deed was done and to copy that. He meant us to learn that he who is really greatest is he who is readiest to cast aside his pride and serve his fellow-men. The world still thinks it difficult to copy Christ's example; but those who know Christ know that it is easy for two reasons.

The first is that Christ showed the way. Christ gave the pattern. You know how much easier it is to do a sum if the teacher has worked one like it on the blackboard. If you have only written directions it seems almost impossible, but with the example before your eyes it is quite another matter.

The second reason is that love helps us. If we love Christ, and if we love our fellow-men, we feel that we can never do enough to serve them. Love makes service joy.

It is told of the famous French artist, Gustave Doré, that, whilst he was painting the face of Christ in one of his pictures, a lady came into his studio. Her gaze fell on the face and she stood transfixed, so wonderful was it. The artist watched her anxiously meanwhile. 'Why do you look at me like that, M. Doré?' she asked. 'I wanted to see what you thought of that face,' was the reply. 'You do like it—don't you?' 'Yes, I do,' said the lady. 'And I'll tell you what I think. I think that you couldn't paint such a face of Christ unless you loved Him.' 'Unless I loved Him!' exclaimed Doré. 'Ah! Madame, I trust I do, and that most sincerely—but as I love Him more I shall paint Him better.'

That artist knew the secret of service. He knew that the more we love the better we serve.

The Christian Year.

The First Sunday after Easter.

Wait.

'Wait for the promise.'—Acts 1[4].

The Apostles obeyed this most difficult command. It was a proof that their lives had been absolutely placed at the disposal of the Master. Christ often tests the love and obedience of His followers by putting before them hard things to do. But perhaps He never tests them so effectually as when He asks them not to do, but to abstain from doing, and to submit to a time of quiet monotony, whilst waiting to know His will.

1. The delay afforded time for preparation, and this was needed even with apostolic men. Strength comes with meditation and with prayer, and we shall need strength if we are to hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast until the end. We do not think of going to the common duties of life unprepared; why should it be otherwise with the holier and more spiritual side of existence? It is noteworthy that all the great leaders of God's Israel have had a time of probation, apart from the stirring duties of the after-life. Moses was forty years in the land of Midian; David was in the wilderness of Judea; Paul listened not to flesh and blood, but went straightway into the deserts of Arabia; and with our Divine Master there was a thirty years' preparation for a three years' ministry. What wonder then, with these Apostles, before they went forth to their arduous labours, if there should be this brief season of waiting and of prayer, to linger in their memory ever afterwards?

You know how for spectators of a drama it is needful that the great events of the drama should not be too rapidly hurried forward upon the scenes, but kept back until the prolonged attention of the spectators has ripened their minds to receive with full understanding and due emotion the grand transactions of the tale. Well, in spiritual things, wherein the dramatist is a Divine Being, there needs the like management and economy: an event must not be hurried upon the mind; the mind must have time to ripen for it—only so will the event have its perfect work. Reason enough then why the promise of the Father was withheld those long ten days; reason enough why Christ said, 'Wait.'[1]

2. Waiting was required because they lacked

[1] J. H. Skrine, *A Goodly Heritage*, 26.

the one thing supremely necessary for apostleship. Their work was to begin with God, and Christ Himself says to them, 'Without me ye can do nothing.' Had they the truth, they lacked the power which was to enforce the truth, and without which the Scriptures themselves are a dead letter. We cannot too often repeat it, the dispensation under which we live is a spiritual one, the gospel itself is a supernatural thing: it came from heaven, and in preaching it rightly, man must be inspired from heaven. Gifts and graces, however eminent, are but as fuel to the flame; the difference between Elijah's altar and Baal's is this, that fire is to come down from heaven and vivify and consecrate and use that fuel. It was not John's baptism, cold and formal and cleansing, these disciples needed—that they had—but one far more searching and illuminating and inspiring, of which Christ Himself had spoken to them—the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

One summer day some friends and I started in a small yacht to sail down Cardigan Bay to Aberdovey. The morning had been breathless, and we had almost abandoned the thought of the expedition; but at two o'clock a fresh and steady breeze sprang up. We embarked, and ran for two hours at a delicious pace over the summer sea. And then quite abruptly the wind dropped. The sails idly flapped, and then were motionless. We were far out in the bay, and the haze entirely hid the land. Suddenly we realized that we were there beyond the reach of help, powerless to move. No steamer ever came on that track; no sailing boat could come. We had no food to speak of. Hour after hour passed. The great sun sank in a splendid glow, marking his path along the glassy waters. Night came. There was nothing for it but to fit out what berths we could in the fore-cabin and under the half-deck, and to make a shift to go to sleep.

As I lay down the thought possessed me, how exactly this represents our impotence apart from the Breath Divine. Our boat is trim, our sails are set, but we cannot move an inch, we cannot even avoid the reefs on which the sinking tide may throw the helpless barque; we depend absolutely on that motion in the air, which is not in us, nor under our control.

Our skipper sat at the helm, smoking his pipe, uncommunicative, and prepared with no comfort. He had knowledge, but no power over the winds. About half-past ten I started up. There was a ripple and a movement. The moon had risen and lit the wide expanse of darkling waters. The sail was flapping again, and filling. As the heated air of the summer day rose from the sea, the cooler air from the Welsh mountains rushed down to replace it, and made a growing breeze. The yacht began to cut the waters. Presently it was gliding through ruffled waves, hissing, as the cloven seas flew over the deck, straining onward with the energy of a living creature. For two hours and a half the steady wind continued until we were able to cast anchor below the estuary of Aberdovey, and wait for the morning star to guide us up the river.[1]

3. We know how they were rewarded for their waiting. We know how, when they were all gathered together, the sound of a rushing, mighty wind was heard; how the tongues of fire appeared, and, parting asunder, rested upon each of them, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost. And we know how at once, when the Spirit descended, the work of the Church began. Men who had once been cowards became full of courage; men who had been always making mistakes became endued with wisdom for their mighty work. And so first at Jerusalem, then at Samaria, and then at length at Rome itself, under the guidance and direction of the Holy Ghost, with enthusiasm and wisdom inspired by Him, the gospel was preached, the Church spread and grew. Surely it was worth while to wait for such a Gift as this—a Gift, which not only made their work effectual, but made it possible.

The Second Sunday after Easter.

The Presence that fails not.

'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'—Mt 28^{20}.

There are three things that especially appeal to us in this promise.

1. The first is that it is the presence not of God as God, but of God as Christ, that is promised. This was to the early disciples something entirely new. It was the same Christ whose feet had walked their hills, whose voice had entered into their consciousness, that was to be with them all the days. It was not just the renewed assurance of the omnipresence of God, the realization that God enfolds us as an impalpable Spirit, as a governing Force in life. The presence of Christ not only enables me to say, 'Since Thou my God art everywhere, I cannot be where Thou art not'; it is the coming to me, as if there were no one else in the world, of the very Christ who was with His disciples in the olden time.

2. The second thing is that this presence is promised to certain people. It is a missionary promise, and unless we are willing to be Christ's witnesses in our own little bit of the world, we cannot justly claim it. The 'go' and the 'lo' are together. It is those who take His yoke who take

[1] R. F. Horton, *The Trinity*, 213.

Christ, and find the rest of going forth to service as His yoke-fellows.

'All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth,' the Lord said; 'go ye therefore——' Is that 'therefore' just the great imperative of a Master who has a right to order us where He will? No, the force of it resides in the promise: 'Go ye therefore, because I go with you.' It is not that He gives me *some* power and bids me go; but that He who has *all* power is going, and asks me to go with Him.

3. The third thing is that it is a promise guaranteed in all places. When Mark gives his account of the disciples' obedience to the command, he says: 'They went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following.' Everywhere the Lord was with them. Christ's people have found this to be true in all ages. In every land and on all the seas they have found Him nigh—found Him in prisons and in palaces, amid strangers and amid friends, in the hours of rapture and in the common ways of life.

'If St. John were in England,' Canon Robinson recently said, 'what wonderful things he would have to say about it, what clouds of glory he would see over Lothbury, what rivers he would see run down the valley of Cheapside!' If we had the seeing eye, no doubt Christ would be more evident to us in the familiar places of life; but it does not need St. John to make the discovery. There was once a man in London, homeless and ill-fed, walking up and down the Embankment, who realized that Christ was near. He says:

Yea, in the night, my Soul, my daughter,
Cry,—clinging Heaven by the hems,
And lo, Christ walking on the water,
Not of Gennesareth but Thames!

I generally cross the Thames twice a day, but I never cross it without thinking of Francis Thompson, clinging Heaven by the hems and finding Christ walking on the water in the centre of the busy city. But he went further; for later on he sang about the Master:

And bolder now and bolder,
I lean upon that shoulder,
So dear
He is and near;
And with His aureole
The tresses of my soul
Are blent
In wished content.

Well, you say, that is poetic imagination; ordinary people cannot realize Christ so near! Suppose, then, we think of Livingstone—whatever Livingstone was, he was not a poet. When out in Africa he was confronted by a chief who refused to let him pass, he thought that in the night he would try to cross the river and escape; but opening his Testament, he read: 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world'; and he said, 'It is the word of a gentleman of the most sacred and strictest honour. I will not cross furtively by night as I intended. It would appear as flight, and should such a man as I flee?' He found the promise true in Africa—the Lord was with him.[1]

The Third Sunday after Easter.

Service in Holiness.

'That we . . . might serve him in holiness.'—Lk 1[74. 75].

Holiness in man may perhaps be defined as instinctive sympathy with and sensitiveness to the interests of God, which are also those of mankind as a whole. It is the moral expression of that active sympathy with God which must be the result of really loving Him, and which grows as we find how utterly His interests and ours coincide. On such deep-seated, often silent, sympathy between two natures human friendship also really depends far more than on any outward acts or words of affection and goodwill. We only properly know and are one with our friend when we have grasped and identified ourselves with his ideals. It is only then that we can really give him the 'service' in which love finds its highest expression—the offering not of acts, or gifts, but of ourselves as soldiers of his will. So we can see the place of Holiness in our friendship with and service of God. And from it other things will follow, converging with cumulative effect upon His problem and ours, the saving of the world. Take only three.

1. In the first place, as we have seen, 'All love assimilates the soul to what it loves.' Sympathy with God produces God-likeness: and one great need of our modern, conventionalized Christianity is to realize afresh that to be a Christian means being not merely 'good' but 'God-like,'—a bigger and harder but also far more interesting thing. '*As* my Father hath sent me, *even so* send I you,' said Christ to His first band of emissaries and representatives: and He says the same to you and me. Our duty is not done when we are morally irreproachable: we are only beginning it when we start doing Christ's own work of saving others at the cost of giving ourselves. And all down the Christian centuries the 'saviours' have been, not the blameless (but quite ineffective) Christian of whom our churches tend to be full—or, should one say, half-empty?—nor the 'regular Churchman' or 'devout Communicant' whose Christianity begins and ends with his religious *devoirs*, but the

[1] W. Y. Fullerton, *The Practice of Christ's Presence.*

men and women who have dared to be God-like, at the cost even of social ostracism, or ex-communication, or martyrdom itself. It is such lives that move the Christian front-line forward: those whose effects on others are God-like because they are swayed to their depths by *sympathy with God*.

2. Again, from this sympathy with God springs instinctive sympathy with men, and even animals and things. (Think, for instance, of St. Francis of Assisi.) This not only makes life far more coherent and fascinating for the 'holy' man himself, but gives him a thousand new channels of influence: which, as he exists only to serve God's aims, means multiplying God's own opportunities of working. 'Moral genius' has been described as 'the innate or acquired power of *feeling* more sensitively for and with other people, of making wider, deeper, more vivid connections.'[1] It is precisely the quality that should strike the eye in every Christian, because his sympathies are, in theory, as wide as those of God Himself; and we all know how it is only when you approach people (or, for that matter, subjects or natural objects) 'sympathetically' that you can get to the heart of them or bring the best out of them. One of the most beautiful sayings about the early Christians that has come down to us is the remark of an unknown educated Christian who wrote a 'defence' of them in 130 A.D., known as 'The Apology of Aristides.' 'Because they acknowledge the goodness of God towards them,' he says, 'therefore on account of them there flows out the beauty that is in the world.' Holiness, sympathy with God, thus appears as the ideal way of 'making the best of' people and things—which means, in other words, helping to save the world.

3. Thirdly, and following from this last thought, he who shares God's ideals and outlook and sympathies, and wants nothing else but to forward His cause, will be God-like not least in being quick to forgive: not only because he owes it to God, and loses his own claim to forgiveness otherwise,—'Forgive us our trespasses, *even as* we also forgive,'—but because this is the Divine and the only method of ending and overcoming evil. 'Love covers the multitude of sins,' not because it does not feel them, but because only so can it lift its object from the actual to the ideal.

If there is one thing clearer than another in Christian experience, it is the way in which the sense of being forgiven unites to God in grateful love, and impels to His service those who before were rebels and enemies. In the bitterness naturally excited by the war and, with treasonable short-sightedness, stimulated further on all sides in the interests of victory, we have the measure of our distance from Christian civilization. In the disappointment which has followed the attempt to secure peace by retribution we are learning our need of a more excellent way. The way of peace, for man as for God, is and always must be the way of forgiveness. What we need is a wider and deeper 'holiness' which, alike in all relations of life, will make us able, like God, to forgive.[2]

[1] Jane Harrison, *Alpha and Omega*, p. 66.

[2] E. A. Burroughs, *The Way of Peace*.

The Fourth Sunday after Easter.

Trust and Knowledge.

'For the which cause I also suffer these things; nevertheless I am not ashamed; for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.'—2 Ti 1^{12}.

The verse is full of beauty in itself and in its context; it stands out as some glorious church whose windows are filled with stained glass. You rest within the holy edifice, and, as the sun breaks out in radiance, new colours and hues pour upon your delighted eyes. Or you stand without in the dark, and the light that shines from within brings before you the glory that woos you to come inside, and see all that those glories stand for, in worship, in life, and in blessing. In the statements of the text there are three essentials. 'I have trusted Him and I know': there is the restfulness of faith. Then, 'I have committed to Him, and I am sure': there is the hopefulness of faith. And then, 'I suffer, and I am not ashamed': there is the dauntlessness of faith.

1. 'I have trusted Him, and I know.' There is the foundation of life, and that is the conviction of faith—'Jesus is,' and He is worth trusting. John Ruskin has said somewhere that the weakness of much Christian preaching consists in the fact that it bids men get up and work for God before it has bidden them stand and see God work for them. It is a mistake to be always watching a vision, and not getting up to work; but there is an equally fatal mistake—and that is, getting up to work before you have seen the vision. And just as there must have been a preparation upon this earth, before man, God's highest creature, could find his home there; and always a nursery-garden (or, if you are a biologist, call it favourable environment) before a child-man can be put into

it; so there must be a work of grace achieved for fallen souls, before there can be rehabilitation in all those spiritual privileges which Christ died to secure for us.

2. 'I have committed to him, and I am sure.' If the other was the foundation of life, this is the temple of fellowship. Here is faith's transference. There is no really living faith that can avoid committing to Him all life, directly that necessity and command is made plain by spoken voice, or by the vision of the inward eye. The responsibility of living for Christ follows inevitably upon the restfulness of life in Christ. When Christ has given you His best, He means you to give Him your best. It means that when He has given His all to you, He demands that you should give your all to Him; and He takes that all, and He makes it what royal property ought always to be—model property.

Our Prince of Wales is going round at the present time to the various estates of which he is master and landlord; and in some cases he is finding that they are unworthy to be the possessions of a prince; and with all the diligence of that young and gallant Christian life, he is setting himself to renovate and repair, in city and country, the things that are royal possessions. Now Jesus Christ, God's Prince of life, makes holy and worthy that which is His.

3. 'I suffer, and I am not ashamed.' If the last was the temple of fellowship, this is the garden of fruitfulness. 'I suffer.' Here is faith's conflict. Reinforcement is provided, but it is a fight still. 'Hold fast that which has been committed, and guard it by the Holy Ghost given unto you.' Remember that if He bids you enter with Him, it is by the way of the Cross. He has never shirked saying it. It will mean suffering; but it is suffering that you would not have been without for all the world, when you come to the resurrection glory that follows. 'I am not ashamed.' There is triumph in that word. There is a dauntlessness here which comes as a result of the security of faith.

It was in a dark heathen land where there was a mission station; and a man came up to one of the Christians, and said, 'Tell me the secret. What is it that you put on the faces of your converts?' He said, 'We do not put anything on their faces.' A pained look came into the face of the heathen, and he said, 'Tell me the truth. You are a Christian, and I thought I had the right to ask; I thought I could have trusted you to say.' And then it dawned upon the Christian what he meant. 'Oh,' he said, 'I can tell you; that is a shining from God.'[1]

[1] Harrington C. Lees, *The Promise of Life*.

The Fifth Sunday after Easter.

The Principles of the Kingdom.

'Thy kingdom come.'—Mt 6^{10}.

Jesus came to establish on earth a kingdom of spiritual and social good, a kingdom of righteousness and love based on sacrifice. That was the great general burden of His teaching, and it supplies a key for the solution of many social problems. For everything in social life and social conditions inconsistent and incompatible with that kingdom is manifestly wrong and should be rectified. It is sufficient to ask concerning any social habit, condition, or institution, 'Can it find a place in the kingdom?' to show at once its true nature and to pass judgment upon it.

Besides His proclamation of Divine Fatherhood and human Brotherhood, and His specific teaching on the importance of the family, the care of the poor, the stewardship of wealth, and the rights and duties of labour, Jesus enunciated certain great fundamental principles which were bound eventually to undermine every social wrong and transform society.

1. The first was *social righteousness*. That had formed the burden of prophetic preaching. To put away the evil of their doings, to seek justice, relieve the oppressed, defend the fatherless and plead for the widow (Is 1^{16}); to trust not in lying words, to oppress not the stranger, to execute judgment between a man and his neighbour (Jer 7^{4}); to execute righteousness and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor; to do no wrong and no violence (Jer 22^{3}); to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God (Mic 6^{8})—such was the continuous message of the prophets. The same high ethical and social ideal is portrayed by the psalmist in the man who walketh uprightly and worketh righteousness and speaketh the truth (Ps 15).

This Old Testament message of righteousness was accepted in its fulness by Jesus and incorporated into His own wider teaching. It was a righteousness inseparable from the Kingdom (Mt 6^{33}), and could be realized only in social life, in ordinary human relationships, not in isolation. Jesus always had citizens of the Kingdom in view.

2. But Jesus asks for more than strict righteousness of conduct between man and man. He asks for *mercy*, as one of the fruits of the Kingdom. Mercy, we are told, is better than sacrifice and

greater even than justice. The merciful man is God-like, for mercy is the highest attribute of Deity. Mercy must never be subordinated to such things as the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin (Lk 6[36]). On one occasion when teaching in the Temple, Jesus enforced the lesson of mercy in a startlingly dramatic fashion (Jn 8[3]), when the chivalry of Jesus shamed the scribes and Pharisees. 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.' And one by one, conscience-stricken, they slunk away as from the judgment-seat.

3. But more even than mercy is expected from citizens of the Kingdom. Love is expected, *brotherly love*. There is singular pathos in our Lord's use of the words 'thy brother' (Mt 5[24] 18[15]). Fraternal love is the distinctive note of the Kingdom, and Jesus gives it the highest place in His social gospel. His law of love is not a code but a spirit, not a set of rigid rules but a controlling principle. Love is central and all-prevailing in His teaching. So clearly is this the case that ninety-nine people out of every hundred if asked what the message of Jesus is would answer unhesitatingly 'a message of love.' Love breathes from His personality, burns in His parables, emanates from every word He uttered, even the sternest, for we feel that behind His sternness there throbs eternal love. Love explains Divine Fatherhood. Love explains the Incarnation and the Divine sacrifice on Calvary.

4. And, further, the love that Jesus asks is *love in action*, love expressed in *sacrifice* and *service*. The 'service of man' is a modern phrase, but the truth underlying it was a commonplace in our Lord's teaching. For next to His great Law of Love comes His great Law of Service, and the second is a corollary of the first. Love for Him meant no mere sentiment of transient emotion, but an energy of soul expressing itself in active ministry, doing good, practical helpfulness. Love proved itself by golden deeds.

On four occasions at least Jesus dwelt impressively upon the Law of Service: first, when He rebuked the desire for precedence and taught that greatness was measured by Service (Mt 20[26]); second, when He showed by washing His disciples' feet that the lowliest service might be the divinest (Jn 13[5]); third, when He spoke the great parable of the Good Samaritan and censured dehumanized religious officialism (Lk 10[30]); and, finally, when He indicated that at the last the crown of welcome would be for those who had performed deeds of love (Mt 25[40]).[1]

[1] D. Watson, *The Social Expression of Christianity*.

The Ḫabiru and the Hebrews.

NEW MATERIAL IN THE PROBLEM.

By S. H. Langdon, M.A., Professor of Assyriology in the University of Oxford.

I need not enter into a detailed examination of the difficult question of the identification of the *amelú Ḫa-bi-ru* in the Canaanish correspondence of Amenhoteph III. and IV. with the Hebrew people of the Old Testament.[2] There is, however, some extremely important material published more recently than any accessible discussion, and to make this new evidence intelligible I begin with a brief résumé. Abdi-Ḫeba, governor of Jerusalem, makes frequent mention of the *Ḫabiru* (genitive-accusative *Ḫabiri*),[3] who plunder the lands of the Egyptian king's Palestinian provinces. In one instance the genitive form *Ḫabiri-(ki)* occurs, that is, the name is followed by the geographical determinative for 'political state,' and hence the *Ḫabiru* were a people and connected more or less vaguely with some province. It is possible to say 'the *Ḫabiru-Ḫabiri* man, or men.' The word is employed only in the singular, and is a diptote, that is, it is inflected in

[2] The most recent and thorough examination of the literature on this subject is by Professor Burney, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, 66–81, and the same scholar's edition of *Judges*, pp. lxxiii–lxxxiv. In this very able review of the sources, Professor Burney inclines to accept the identification, and he rightly in that case regards the description of the Ḫabiru in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries as revealed by the Amarna Letters as applicable to westward migrations of the Hebrews between the age of Abraham and the Exodus of the early thirteenth century.

[3] The letters of Abdi-Ḫeba are edited in Knudtzon, *El-Amarna-Tafeln*, Nos. 285–290. On the possible reading of this name as Mittanni or Ḫittite, see Knudtzon, p. 1333, and Gustav in *Orientalische Literatür-Zeitung*, 1911, 341.

the genitive and accusative by the same inflectional ending *î*. For example, the Jerusalem scribe writes, 'You love the *amēlu Ḫabiri*,' *i.e.* 'the *Ḫabiru*-man,' an example of the collective singular accusative.[1] And another passage has *amelû Ḫabiru ḫabat*, 'The *Ḫabiru*-men plunder,'[2] where the plural is employed as a grammatical singular in the nominative case, the verb being in the singular. On the other hand, the scribe writes, *tilikiu amelû Ḫabiru*, 'The *Ḫabiru* men take,' where *Ḫabiru* is employed as a nominative plural.[3] An example of the genitive is *ana amelû Ḫa-bi-ri-(ki)*, 'To the *Ḫabiru*-men.'[4] Since gentilic formations in Assyrian drop the plural ending before adding the gentilic suffix (*āia*), (*īi*),[5] it seems probable that *Ḫabiru*, *Ḫabiri* are for *Ḫabirû*, *Ḫabirî*, that is, the *Ḫabirite*. The strictly philological side of this problem has never been emphasized, and even the statements on the gentilic endings in the Assyrian grammars have not been made thoroughly scientific.[6] The old Babylonian (Assyrian so far as this northern people adopted it) generic ending is *īi*, as in Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopic. The Babylonians inflected this ending, nominative *īiu* > *û*, genitive *īii* > *î*, accusative *iia* > *â*, which seems to have disappeared in favour of the genitive *î*, leaving the gentilic noun a diptote.[7] So, for example, the Babylonian word for Amorite would be declined:

N. *amurrû*, sing. and plural.
G. *amurrî*,[8] „ „
A. *amurrâ*,[9] „ „

So we have already in the classical period the shortened gentilic in *amēlû Ba-ab-bi-li*, 'the Babylonians';[10] *ina alāni šumeri*(*m*), 'from the Sumerian cities.'[11] The feminine form *īiṭu* becomes *îtu*, *Amurrîtu*, *Babilîtu*, regularly inflected, *îtu*, *îti*, *îta*, the singular supposedly replacing the plural. (No plural examples.) Now if, as seems probable, *Ḫabiru* and *Ḫabiri* are really shortened gentilic formations, supposedly of the Arabic-Babylonian type, are there parallel examples to prove that this is a gentilic, and, if so, a gentilic of true Babylonian-Arabic-Canaanitish type as over against the Aramaic-Assyrian gentilic ending *āia*, *ā-a*, or (with endings *u*, *i*), *û*, *î* (*ê*)? We have for the formation *īiu*, regularly, *šarru Kaššû*, 'the Cassite king,' *amelu Kaššû*, 'the Cassite,' gen. *Kaššî* (*Kaššê* by obscuring *ī* > *ē*). But Nebuchadnezzar calls himself *ikkaru babbilu*, 'the Babylonian husbandman,'[12] and the ending is omitted altogether in *māti šumer u akkadîm*, 'in the Sumerian and Akkadian land.'[13] The Babylonians formed the gentilic for Egyptian *Miṣrû* (no examples), *Miṣrî* (often *Miṣrî*), where the Assyrians employ the Aramaic form *Miṣrâ*, *Miṣrāi*. The Aramaic ending is the one usually employed in late Babylonian. Note, for example, that the Babylonians wrote *amelu A-ra-mu*, 'the Aramean,'[14] and this form with short *u* is common in Assyria,[15] genitive *Arimi*, *Arime*.[16] These gentilic case-endings are employed with great irregularity in late Assyrian, as were also the ordinary case-endings. The point is that the gentilic ending *īiu*, *īii* > *û*, *î* was shortened to *u*, *i* in many cases. Hence we find *Miṣrî* and *Miṣri* employed indifferently in the Amarna Letters.

Now the ending *âia* > *āi*[17] does not appear in Babylonian until Aramaic influence becomes manifest in the Cassite period. The Assyrians appear to have adopted it first, and it is, in fact, not improbable that the Assyrians were themselves of Aramaic stock. At any rate, the Assyrians at first added case-endings to *āia*, obtaining *āia-û* > *û* and

[1] Knudtzon, 286, 19.
[2] *Ibid.* 286, 56.
[3] *Ibid.* 288, 38.
[4] *Ibid.* 299, 24.
[5] That is the ordinary rule in Arabic also, see Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, § 254, and Brockelman, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, i. § 220.
[6] Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*[2], p. 184; Meissner, *Assyrische Grammatik*, p. 24; Ungnad, *Babylonisch Assyrische Grammatik*, p. 28. None of these writers help the student in the least regarding the syntax and declension of gentilics; Böhl, *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*, does not mention gentilics at all; and Ebeling's monograph on the grammar of the Amarna Letters is confined to the verb, see *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, vol. viii. part 2, 39-79.
[7] By analogy with plural diptote ending *û*, *î*.
[8] See Schorr, *Altbabylonische Rechtsurkunden*, No. 269, 1 and 21.
[9] The only accusative gentilic form known to me is *amura-am* in Thureau-Dangin, *Recueil de Tablettes Chaldéennes*, No. 85, and 124 Rev. 4 (cited by Ungnad, *Materialien zur Akkadischen Sprache*, 92).
[10] An accusative (Ungnad, *Babylonische Briefe*, No. 81, 15. 17). Ungnad regards it as a nominative here. The passage is broken.
[11] Poebel, *Historical and Grammatical Texts*, No. 34, col. 17, 22.
[12] Langdon, *Neubabylonische Königsinschriften*, 104. 19.
[13] *Ibid.* 92. 16.
[14] L. W. King, *Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, ii. 81; cf. the full form *Aramû*, 59. 8.
[15] I. Rawlinson, 37. 37.
[16] See Schiffer, *Die Aramäer*, 8-9, and p. 157, *et passim*.
[17] Written *a-a*.

āia-i > *āi* > *ê* (genitive-accusative). So we have *Aḫlamû*, 'the Ahlamite,'[1] and the uncontracted form *amelu Aḫ-la-ma-u* (= *Aḫlamāia-u*) in the Amarna Letters. The genitive-accusative is regularly *Aḫlamê*, but *Aḫ-la-ma-i* occurs. When we find a gentilic like *Aššurû* it is impossible to classify the form until the genitive or the feminine is discovered. The genitive of the *îi* formation would be *Aššurî*, and the feminine *Aššurîtu*.[2] Now these are the gentilic forms of the word for 'Assyrian,' and it consequently belongs to the older group. But the same word also appears as *Aššurāi-u*, a gentilic of the younger group.[3] The feminine of the second group ends in *āi-a-tu* > *ā'itu*, *e'itu*, and is a sure indication of class. So, for example, we have *Arkû*, 'the man of Erech,' and *Arkāiitu*, 'the woman of Erech'; *Armāi*, the Aramean,'[4] and *Ar-me-i-tu*, 'the Aramean woman.' Unfortunately no feminine of *Ḫabiru* is known. A pure Aramaic formation without Babylonian case-ending occurs, as is well known, in the Cassite period, or about the same time as the Amarna Letters. A Cassite king of about 1450 B.C. writes to an Assyrian usurper (?)[5] and accuses him of intrigue with a Cassite *Ḫarbišipak Ḫa-bir-āi*, 'Harbishipak the Habirite.'[6] 'Habirite' means 'mercenary' here. Again the Babylonian king Marduk-aḫê-erba (1080 *circa*) has left a memorial deed by which he bestowed an estate upon one Kudurra, son of — *-ušsuru* the *Ḫa-bir-āi*.'[7] There is no reason to suppose that this favourite of the Babylonian king who lived in the perilous days of the *Sutû* aggressions was a Cassite. The name was common in Semitic Babylonia. Marduk-aḫê-erba's predecessor Adad-apal-iddin was an Aramaic usurper.[8] Babylonian kings of this troubled period made a habit of bestowing estates upon able soldiers, and Kudurra the Habirite was no exception. Here, again, the term seems to indicate a mercenary soldier.

Winckler has given a preliminary account of the extraordinary treaties made by the kings of Ḫatti with Mittanni, Nuḫašše, and Kizzuwadni. In the oaths of these treaties a large number of Hittite, Mittanni, and related deities are invoked, among them the *ilāni ḫa-bi-ri*, 'Habirite gods.' The treaty between Tette, king of Nuḫašše, and Šubbiluliuma, king of Ḫatti (Hittites), invokes a list of over fifty gods. Near the end occurs this passage, 'The goddess Nindubdubna of Ḳadeš, the Lebanon Mountains, Mount Šariiana, Mount Bîšaita, the gods of Lulaḫḫi,[9] the gods of Ḫabiri, the goddess Ereškigal.'[10] On the other hand, the treaty between Šubbiluliuma and Mattiuāza of Mittanni has in an equally long list of gods the following passage: 'The god Maniiawanniš of the city Landa, the gods of Lulaḫî,[11] the gods *SA-GAZ*.'[12] A variant copy has *ilāni šiluḫḫi ilāni ša amel SA-GAZ*, gods of *šiluḫḫi*,[13] gods of the *SA-GAZ* men.[14] This leaves no longer any doubt about the meaning of the Sumerian word *SA-GAZ*, it does mean the Habirite and cannot be rendered in any other way here. Why should the Hittite kings include the gods of this roving people in their pantheon? Can it be for any other reason than that these adventurers were now in the Hittite army as mercenary soldiers, precisely as they appear to have been associated with the Cassite military a half-century earlier?[15]

When did the Ḫabirites obtain this reputation as warriors, roving soldiers of fortune, mercenary fighting men in the employ of various military powers of Western Asia? They are ordinarily designated by the Sumerian word *sagaz* = Semitic *ḫabbatu*, 'warrior, plunderer.' Now the verb *ḫabātu* means originally 'smite with violence,' rob, plunder. The idea of doing personal violence is fundamental in this root. It is employed in § 196 of the Code of Hammurabi in *lex talionis*: 'If a freeman destroy the eye of a freeman, they shall destroy his eye.' The verb has almost ex-

[1] *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, by Figulla and Weidner, vol. i. p. 39. 37.

[2] King, *Annals of the Kings of Assyria*, 62. 36.

[3] *Amarna Letters*, Knudtzon, No. 8, 31; *Boghazköi*, *ibid.* i. p. 3. 50.

[4] Klauber, *Politisch-Religiöse Texte*, No. 25, Rev. 10.

[5] So Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, i. 389–396.

[6] IV. Rawlinson, 34, No. 2, 5.

[7] Hilprecht, *Old Babylonian Inscriptions*, No. 149. Obv. 22. See also Hinke, *A New Boundary Stone*, 190–5.

[8] King, *Chronicles*, vol. ii. 59.

[9] An unknown people; *ilāni lu-la-aḫ-ḫi* is a generic construction.

[10] Figulla-Weidner, *Boghazköi*, i. p. 21, 27–29.

[11] *ilāni-lu-la-ḫi-i*. Note the unshortened gentilic, proving *lulaḫḫi* and *ḫabiri* to be gentilics.

[12] (*ilāni SA-GAZ*). Figulla-Weidner, i. p. 7, 50.

[13] For this variant of Lulaḫḫi another Šubbiluliuma-Mattiuāza treaty has *ilani-ša nu-la-aḫ-[ḫi ilāni ša amel] SA-GAZ*, *ibid.* p. 14, 4–5.

[14] *Ibid.* p. 11, 27, *ilāni ša amel SA-GAZ*.

[15] Šubbiluliuma may be dated 1400–1350 (*circa*).

clusively a military signification in Assyrian texts, and especially in the Amarna Letters, and the new texts of the Hittite archives. Asiatic armies always associated war with plunder, and invariably say that they 'plundered' a land when they captured it; *ḫabbatu* is, then, a word for 'fighting man,' and it was translated into Sumerian correctly *sa-gaz* = *sag-gaz*, 'to smite the head,' to slay. An ancient Sumerian incantation describes the *gallû* demon as the *sa-gaz šu-nu-gi*, 'the smiter who is not turned back.'[1] Even Tetti, king of the north Syrian Hittite tribe of Nuḫašše, is called an *amel sa-gaz*.[2] The Babylonians invariably translated titles into Sumerian. Names of professions, religious and secular, in Babylonia, are either of Sumerian origin or translated into that official language. If the Ḫabirite became a professional soldier, and was known as a mercenary fighting man, his profession would have been translated into Sumerian by force of custom. The very fact that the Habirite has a Sumerian title proves that he held a legal status as a professional soldier. And his title *sag-gaz* > *sa-gaz* is the natural translation of *ḫabbatu*, 'soldier.'

Now it is obvious that a *sa-gaz* or 'fighting man' might be of any nationality. It is commonly associated with the Habirites, but it may have been used of any race or of any one who had *an official status* in some military power. The translation 'free booter,' 'roving soldier,' will not do. *Sagaz* implies a legal military profession, and in the Amarna Letters it almost certainly refers to mercenary soldiers in the Hittite army. Beyond doubt the Habirites so lent themselves to this service that the generic term 'Habirite' became technically and legally a word for 'mercenary soldier'; when the governors of Palestinian cities write to the king of Egypt and mention the *sagaz*, whereas the king of Jerusalem mentions only the Habirites, they all refer to mercenary soldiers of the Hittite army. The *Sutû* who appear in the Amarna period in much the same rôle as the Ḫabiru are expressly distinguished from the *sagaz*-men.[3] The governor of Gazri (Gezer) makes frequent[4] complaint about the *sa-gaz*, as does his neighbour about the Ḫabiru. The same complaint comes from the city Ḫazi[5] concerning the invading *sa-gaz*.[6] Similar complaints come from Ḳadeš in Syria on the Orontes[7] and Gebal on the coast north of Beirut,[8] whose governor infers that the *sagaz* were in employ of the Amorite army.[9] From the letters of Rib-Addi of Gebal it seems that the mercenary army of the *sagaz* held possession of all the coast land between the Orontes and Beirut at the close of the fifteenth century, undoubtedly with the connivance of the Hittites, who were in alliance with the Amorites against Egypt. Also the region of Sidon and Tyre in north Palestine fell to the *sagaz* troops.[10]

The possibility of identifying *ḫabiru* with the Hebrew עִבְרִי is philologically unquestionable. Objection to this was raised by Professor Luckenbill in the *American Journal of Theology*, vol. xxii. p. 37, because Winckler and Böhl had given out a preliminary report concerning the Hittite treaty with Tetti, in which the reading *ilāni ḫa-ab-bi-ri* was said to exist.[11] This statement was repeated by Professor J. Powis Smith in *the American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. xxxv. p. 230, in a review of Dr. Burney's *Judges*. The objection was made that *Ḫabiru* is really a *kattil* formation, and consequently the identification with *ʿibrî* would be impossible. But the cuneiform text now published by Figulla and Weidner has *ilāni ḫa-bi-ri*.[12] Certainly we must assume that these two careful editors, whose copies were collated by Hrozný, have given the true reading.

But the Habirites were already professional soldiers in the army of Rim-Sin, king of Larsa (2155–2095), contemporary of Hammurabi, king of Babylon (2123–2080), who also employed them. The evidence is as follows:—Shortly before the War a large number of tablets of this period were sold in Europe and America from clandestine digging of Arabs on the site of ancient Larsa, modern Senkereh. In 1915 Père Scheil dis-

[1] Lutz, *Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts*, No. 127, Obv. i. 7.

[2] Hrozný, *Hethitische Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, vol. i. 136, 137.

[3] Knudtzon, No. 318, 13. Letter from Dagantakala in south Palestine. See also 195, 27–29.

[4] *Ibid.* 298, 27; 299, 18, 24.

[5] Usually located in north Palestine in the region of Tyre.

[6] Knudtzon, Nos. 185–186.

[7] *Ibid.* 189.

[8] *Ibid.* 68.

[9] *Ibid.* No. 71, 21.

[10] *Ibid.* Nos. 144–149.

[11] See Böhl, *Kanaanäer und Hebräer*, p. 87. Böhl repeated this reading as a note signed W(inckler) in *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1916, p. 184.

[12] This genitive-accusative form is employed in the nominative case in the Hittite text. That need cause no surprise, for case-endings are employed loosely at this time even in Assyrian.

covered on a small Larsa record of the military archives of Rim-Sin this important record: 'Four flounced cloaks for the sergeants of the *amel Ḫa-bi-ri*, received from Ibni-Adad the master workman. They are in the reckoning of the temple of Shamash. [Delivered by] the hand of Ili-ippalzam. Month of Nisan, 11th day, year when Rim-Sin became king.'[1] The *ḫabiri* in this Sumerian record are obviously private soldiers, for they are under the supervision of the *uku-uš*, Semitic *ridû*, a military officer of low rank. A large number of these Larsa records were sold to the Babylonian Collection of Yale University, and 253 of them have been neatly and accurately published by Miss E. M. Grice in *Records from Ur and Larsa, dated in the Larsa Dynasty*. In several of these texts *amelsa-gaz* occurs; it is obviously a variant of *ḫabiru*. I give a résumé of each of the Sumerian records of Larsa which refer to the *lù sa-gaz* or 'fighting man.'

A. Grice, No. 33. Eighteen sheep levied[2] for the *lù sa-gaz*, from two shepherds. Seals of the overseers. 11th month, 21st day. Year when the great court of Shamash was built. Reign of Warad-Sin.

B. Grice, No. 47. Thirty-four sheep levied for the *lù sa-gaz*, from a shepherd. Seals of the overseers. 10th month. Same year as A.

C. Grice, No. 50. Seventeen sheep *lù sa-gaz-šú*, 'for the fighting men,' brought by Ibašši-ili. Taken in charge by Ibni-Ea. Seals of the overseers. Ninth month. Year when Kazallu was destroyed. Unknown date. Either Warad-Sin or one of his immediate predecessors.

D. Grice, No. 46. Sheep 'for the fighting (*sagaz*) men,' brought by Taribum. Taken in charge by Abu-ṭâbum. Seals of the overseers. Ninth month. Same year as C.

E. Grice, No. 51. Eighteen sheep, food for the fighting men (*sagaz*), brought by Imgur-Sin. Seals of the witnesses. Seventh month. Same year as C.

F. Grice, No. 52. Thiry-five sheep, food for the fighting men (*sagaz*), brought by Sin-idinnam. Seals of the overseers. Ninth month. Same year as C.

G. Grice, No. 53. Fourteen sheep, food for the fighting men (*sagaz*), brought by Abi-ṭâbum. Seals of the witnesses. Same month and year as C.

The Habirites or *sagaz* men thus appear in history first as mercenaries in the service of Warad-Sin (2167–2155), son of Kudurmabuk the Elamite, and again in the first year of his more famous brother Rim-Sin. For this reason Scheil regards them as an Elamitic, a Cassite, or lower Mesopotamian people. If we maintain the historicity of Genesis 14, and see in Ariok of Ellasar, Warad-Sin of Larsa, in Kedorlā'ōmer of Elam, Kudurmabuk the Elamite, father of Warad-Sin and Rim-Sin, and in Amraphel Hammurabi of Babylon, then it is probable that these Habirites served in the armies of Larsa and Babylon when they invaded Syria and Palestine in the age of Abraham the Hebrew. That is the conclusion to which Scheil adheres. I quite agree, however, with Dr. Burney[3] on this question. There is no reason for assuming that the Habirites at Larsa were not a west Semitic people. In fact, the new Larsa tablets at Yale University identify them with the *sagaz* who were also Habirites in the service of Hittites and Amorites of the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries.

They served also in the armies of Hammurabi, as we know from the following letter published by the late Professor L. W. King:[4] 'To Sin-idinnam say, thus writes Hammurabi: "When thou seest this tablet send to me Ili-tukulti the baker who is in the service Apil-Shamash, and who is now resident with Anu-pî-Sin the captain of the *amel sa-gaz pl.*."'

The evidence, then, is conclusive for the identification of the Ḫabiru at Babylon and Larsa in the twenty-second to the twenty-first centuries with the Ḫabiru in Syria, and Palestine six centuries later. They could have received the name *sagaz* only

[1] *Revue d'Assyriologie*, 12, 115. The word rendered 'cloak' was erroneously copied by Scheil. He should have copied *gú* not *kar* in line 1, as the ordinary ideogram *gú-èn* = *maḫlaptu* (Brünnow, 3293) shows. *Gú-en*, *gú-an* passed into Semitic as *guanakku* and into Greek as καυνάκη, kaunakes. The same group of Larsa texts at Yale University have the same ideogram copied by Miss Grice, *Letters from Ur and Larsa*, No. 165.

[2] *maš-gid-a*, a term in the contracts of Larsa meaning literally 'kid seized (as revenue),' and corresponding to the term *šu-gid* in the Drehem tablets. See Legrain, *Le Temps des Rois d'UR*, p. 29.

[3] *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, p. 78.

[4] *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, No. 35. See also Ungnad, *Babylonische Briefe*, No. 26.

from the Sumerians or Babylonians, most certainly the latter, because they had a legal status as a class of people in the service of the State.

The Habirites appear, therefore, to have been a wandering people precisely as Hebrew tradition describes the *'Ibrim*, the Israelites, and the sons of Jacob. Were their heroic deeds in the services of Larsa, Babylon, and the Hittites also written in the Book of Jashar? When I first came upon the Larsa texts and discovered the undoubted identity of the Ḫabiru of the twenty-second century with those of the Amarna period, their identity with the Hebrews of Old Testament tradition seemed impossible.[1] The implications were so large as to be overpowering. But with what other important people can we identify them, even if we deny the perfect philological evidence? The Hittite treaty speaks of their gods, and that need not surprise us. Only the branch of their people led by Abraham and descended through the line of Jacob received the revelation of monotheism. Were the Old Testament mere profane history few would refuse to grant historicity to its traditions. Why should we not see in this Canaanitish people an ancient race who wandered into the civilized land of Sumer and Akkad along with the western Semites of Maer and Amurru in the twenty-fourth century and founded the dynasties of Isin (2356) and Babylon (2224)? The subject is one which invites endless conjecture. Volumes of doubtful value may be written from this inspiring theme and the whole structure overthrown by the publication of a single cuneiform tablet. I venture at any rate in the direction of accepting the historicity of the traditions of Genesis as controlled by external sources.

[1] That has been the opinion consistently advocated by Sayce.

Contributions and Comments.

The Name Achikar.

In 1898 Messrs. Conybeare and R. Harris with Mrs. A. S. Lewis published some Syriac, Armenian, Greek, and Arabic texts containing the story of Achikar, and in 1911 E. Sachau published an Aramaic copy of the same work, ostensibly belonging to a Jewish community which flourished at Elephantine in the fifth century B.C. The Syriac form of the name is אחיקר, and this is also found in the Aramaic text. It admits of a Hebrew etymology, 'Precious brother,' to be pronounced *akh yaqar*.

Now this personage figures in the Book of Tobit, which in 11[1] mentions a place called Κασερείν in the Sinaitic text, Καισάρειαν in another. The latter name (Cæsarea) would fix the date of the work well within the time of the Roman Empire; but the former, which is also Latin, being derived from *Castrum* or *Castra*, would indicate a date but little earlier. Hence the evidence of the Book of Tobit for the true name of Achikar is of importance; as, if this form be a corruption which can be traced within the MSS. of Tobit, it follows that the Aramaic Achikar is not a work of the fifth century B.C., but of the twentieth A.D.

Now it may be assumed that the best text of Tobit is that to which the editors Fritzsche and Swete give the priority, viz. that of Codex B; the next best that to which they assign the second place, viz. the Sinaitic. The first of these has regularly the form Ἀχειάχαρος or Ἀχιάχαρος; the second varies between Ἀχείχαρος, Ἀχειάχαρος, Ἀχεικάρ, Ἀχείκαρος, Ἀχίχαρος.

Now the Greek χ is used to transliterate the Hebrew ך and ח, the Greek κ for ק. It is most unlikely that when ח and ק occurred in the same word, they would both be transliterated by χ. On the other hand, there is a rule of Greek euphony (Kühner, *Ausf. Grammatik*, i. § 67), which forbids the recurrence of an aspirate in successive syllables; hence ἐκεχείρια is written for ἐχεχείρια, Καλχηδών or Χαλκηδών, etc. There is then a sufficient reason for the alteration of Ἀχείχαρος to Ἀχείκαρος, but not for the contrary alteration.

Now Ἀχειάχαρος stands for אחיאחר, which may be compared with אחרח (according to Gesenius for אחר אה) of 1 Ch 8[1]. This name means 'my brother left behind,' and appears to be translated in 1[22] ἦν δὲ ἐξάδελφός μου, which means 'he was my brother's son.' A man's posterity is called his אחרית, of which this verb is a denominative.

Hence the name Achiachar belongs to the fiction of Tobit, and has no independent existence; for the word *my* in 'My brother left behind' means *Tobit's*. The Story of Achikar, which in 1898 was (with doubtful kindness) rescued from its obscurity, is therefore a supplementary fiction to Tobit, whose date is not earlier than our era, though some place it as late as the year 100 A.D.

The Sachau papyrus, which has not even the correct form of the name, but one corrupted by Greek scribes, is therefore quite certainly a forgery; and its companions must share its condemnation, not without sins of their own.

D. S. Margoliouth.

Oxford.

The S.W.H.

In 1918 Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton published the life of Dr. Elsie Inglis. They have now published a complete history of the great undertaking which Dr. Inglis initiated and for which she gave her life—*The History of the Scottish Women's Hospitals*, edited by Mrs. Shaw M'Laren (7s. 6d. net).

The story of the S.W.H. is told almost entirely in the words of the women who did the work. This method has its disadvantages. Many of the letters quoted are business letters from the different hospitals abroad to the Central Committee in Edinburgh, urging special needs. Much matter of great interest was necessarily excluded from the letters so that they should run no risk of delay at the hands of the Censor. The diaries also from which extracts are given were not written with a view to publication.

But if the method has its disadvantages it has also its advantages. It does not admit of embroidery. We are impressed with the sincerity of the account and of its fidelity to fact. The story, in spite of its omissions, and with all its restraint, is a living story. And its scope is wide, for the whole field of operation of the S.W.H. is covered.

In December 1914 the first complete unit, under Miss Ivens of Liverpool, arrived at Royaumont, which they were not to leave until the end of 1918. It was in December 1914 also that a complete unit set sail for Serbia. Four hospitals were soon established, and the long drawn-out battle against typhus began 'in which no woman played the coward — no woman asked to come away.' The arduous spring of 1915 was followed by a peaceful summer, and this was followed in its turn by the dangers and privations of the Great Retreat in November.

Part Five of the history gives an account of the work of the S.W.H. with the Serb Division in Russia and Roumania. Part Six deals with the work done for the Serbs during their exile, until their victorious return once more to the land they loved.

Two things at least were accomplished by the women of the S.W.H. Dr. Hutchison wrote to Dr. Inglis from Calais in December 1914: 'It would be nice to feel when we leave that we had sensibly advanced the whole position of women by our little contribution of work here.' To-day we can say that the fine work done by these hospitals, manned from end to end by women—women doctors and surgeons, women drivers who took the ambulance cars into the firing-line, and women stretcher-bearers who lifted the wounded—has very sensibly advanced the cause of women.

The second thing these women of the S.W.H. did was to make a lasting place for themselves in the affection of the men they succoured. At the end of the history there is given, very fittingly, an article which was contributed by 'a warrior' to the Belgrade *Evening News* (17th February 1919). It is an appreciation of the work of the S.W.H. Of these women the writer says: 'Let their country be proud of them, for they are deserving of honour in full measure, and the Serbian soldier shall remember them with great thankfulness.'

A. W. Hastings.

Manchester.

A New Edition of Wettstein.

Dr. Moffatt, in his most valuable review of *Thirty Years of New Testament Criticism* (The Expository Times, December 1919), makes the following suggestion: 'A new edition of Wettstein is required or something to take the place of his rare edition.' It will interest Dr. Moffatt and other readers of The Expository Times to know that a new edition of Wettstein's monumental work is contemplated by the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, and that the services of a large number of leading

New Testament and classical scholars are being enlisted on behalf of this most important enterprise.

MAURICE JONES, D.D.

Peppard Rectory, Henley-on-Thames.

St. Paul and Euripides.

IN the October number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES my friend Dr. Rendel Harris suggests that in Ac 21^{39} St. Paul is quoting Euripides—a supposition likely enough in itself, since Euripides, with his wide outlook on life and his broad human sympathies, was a popular poet in greater Greece, and would, almost certainly, have been read by St. Paul. May I add another possible instance of quotation from the 'Alcestis'? In 1 Ti 6^{12} Timothy is exhorted to fight the good fight (ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα; cf. 2 Ti 4^{7}). In the 'Alcestis,' 648, Admetus says, καίτοι καλόν γ' ἂν τόνδ' ἀγῶν' ἠγωνίσω.

H. W. FULFORD.

Crowmarsh Rectory, Wallingford-on-Thames.

A Group of Four Apostles.

ST. PETER and the two sons of Zebedee are often grouped together in our minds, because our Lord made them into a sort of inner band among the Twelve, as at the Transfiguration, and at the healing of the daughter of Jairus, etc. (Mt 17^{1} 26^{37}, Mk 1^{29} 5^{37} 14^{33} 9^{2}, Lk 8^{51} 9^{28}). Their previous friendship and partnership may partly account for this.

There seems to be some evidence for the existence of another group of four, a group which I will call Hellenist, for lack of a better name. The link which connects this group is the use of Greek names, in some cases as an alternative, or an addition to the Semitic one, but in other cases apparently alone.

Dr. Burkitt in the *Interpreter*, October 1911, pp. 98, 99, suggests that Bartholomew is a popular distortion of Ptolemy, which would be a Greek name in the first century. Bartholomew is always mentioned in the Apostolic line with φίλιππος, another of the Twelve who bore a *Greek* name. And they walked together—or sat together, so that the narrator or narrators naturally put their names together in compiling a name-list (Mt 10^{3}, Mk 3^{18}, Lk 6^{14}).

In Ac 1^{13} Thomas' name comes in between these two. But he was also called Didymus (Jn 21^{2}) in some circles. It would be natural for these three men, who had some *Greek* connexion, to be in closer touch with each other than others, *e.g.* with the two Jacobs (James) and John, and the two Judes (Judas).

But Bartholomew and Nathanael (Jn 1^{45}) are often (I think rightly) identified. Now it is the *Greek*-named Philip who brings Nathanael to our Lord. And (Jn 21^{2}) it is the *Greek*-named Didymus who is Nathanael's companion at the lake.

Andrew *may* be another member of this group. And it is Andrew and Philip, whose names (in Greek) suggest 'manliness' and 'love of horses,' who tell our Lord of the *Greeks* who wanted to see Him. They were not Jews of the dispersion, Hellenists; but real Greeks, Hellenes. As St. Andrew was Simon Peter's brother it makes this group very large. But the *Greeks* went to Philip, who certainly bore a Greek name, *first* (Jn $12^{20.\ 22}$).

Of course if Andrew had Greek connexions, his brother Simon shared this, unless indeed it were through marriage. Simon is a Hebraic name, and his new name Cephas is Semitic, but the *Greek* equivalent Peter is more usual even in the Gospels. It follows, perhaps, that the Greek equivalent did not only come into use when he had to deal with Gentiles (Antioch and later), but was in use in the earlier days, *i.e.* before and just after Pentecost. If the above view of a Greek-speaking element in the Apostolic band is correct, the question as to our Lord speaking Greek, and perhaps also the question as to the use of the LXX by Him and by His apostles, are nearer to a solution.

He quoted Dt 6^{13} 10^{20}, Gn 2^{24}, etc., according to the LXX readings. St. Peter discoursed with Cornelius, etc., without an interpreter. Then, our Lord and he were bilingual!

GEORGE FARMER.

Wellesley House, Walmer.

Entre Nous.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

Considerateness.

When William of Wykeham founded the great English school which bears his name he gave a motto to the scholars—'Manners maketh man.' Dr. W. T. A. Barber, late Headmaster of the Leys School in Cambridge, is not afraid of taking the motto at its face value. Even outward manners maketh man, he thinks, the dress he wears, the punctilious politeness he maintains. There is, no doubt, always the danger of making the man nothing but manners. And in our day, when emphasis is laid on reality, that danger is so vividly recognized that manners maketh much more for directness than for politeness. But William of Wykeham's aphorism goes deeper. In the first place, 'there is no action without reaction; the manners which are themselves the indication of an inner reverence have the effect of cherishing and preserving reverence. And, in the second place, the true gentleman is to be detected not by the fact that he knows the conventions of society, but by his consideration for others.'

Manner is an indication of character. Says Dr. Barber, 'Every one who has experience of choosing men to occupy responsible posts is conscious of how much his decision is biased by the thousand and one little things of manner, the niceties of dress, directness, *savoir faire*, the writing of a letter, the mode of expression. The remonstrance may very well be made that the criteria are poor and the judgment shallow which will be guided by such superficialities. But in reality the criticism fails; these things, small as they are, are indications of inward qualities working outwards. Granted that it is often the case that a good and easy manner may be a mere veneer, yet manners themselves are valuable indications, and ere long become sure declarations.

There are many small matters, such as promptly answering invitations, quickly acknowledging inquiries of kindnesses, and respecting conventions, whose absence the world is sure to miss. He who is punctilious in observing these is really declaring that he takes pleasure in showing respect to others' expectations and desires. Any fixed society must necessarily develop conventions, and true breeding demands a reasonable amount of consideration of them. They have their place; they may be regarded as the price of membership or as the signs of privilege. To ignore them is to betray an exaggeration of the value of self which is the reverse of true good manners. One can to a certain extent respect and sympathize with the impatience of young people with what seems to be, and sometimes is, tedious and unmeaning ceremony. There is a great rebound in the rising generation against many of the little observances to which we are accustomed. But their origin lies in consideration of others' convenience or feelings, and it is impossible to avoid an uneasy sense that in this rebound there is some injury to the original roots of unselfishness and chivalry.

I.

Take the management of Divine Service in illustration. In his manner of reading, his tone, his pace, a man may allow himself, only too easily, to think of himself alone. He may consult only his own likes and dislikes in attitude, gesture, and air. But if so, he is greatly failing in the homely duty of loyal considerateness.

A service is not something that we do for ourselves; it is always rendered to another. The true meaning of the word is seen in such expressions as "active service," "domestic service," "do me a service." Yet in the highest connexion its meaning is often completely lost sight of. Divine Service is made a matter of personal preference.

II.

Not less necessary is considerateness in the Preaching of the Word. Canon Ottley discovers in the sermons of Lancelot Andrewes a compassionate tenderness for common people, a gracious considerateness and respect, which more than any other trait appeals to our modern sympathies. An instinctive abhorrence of violent, harsh, coercive methods; faith in the attractive and winning power of truth clearly presented; a vivid sense of the heightening of human relationships which Christianity has introduced; the motherhood of the Church, the sonship and brotherhood of man, the paternal regard and right of control that belongs to true kingship—

all these are genuine elements in Andrewes' view of mankind, and give us a clue to his influence.

This spirit of considerateness which distinguishes Andrewes from other prominent churchmen of his time was one main secret of his laborious industry as a teacher. In his exposition of the fifth commandment, he lays down the duties and qualifications of the teaching office. "In the *manner* of his teaching," he says that a teacher must, "first clear parables and dark speeches; secondly, proceed in method and order; thirdly, teach as his hearers are able to learn (John xvi. 12)." This last point would require a careful consideration of the capacities and needs of the hearers. Andrewes' own work was mainly the systematic instruction of an educated and well-informed audience; but here, too, he remembered that he was dealing with frail and tempted human beings, each having his own trials, needs, and secret longings for the life of goodness. "The tidings," he tells them, "of the gospel are as well for Lydia the purple seller, as for Simon the tanner; for the Areopagite, the judge at Athens, as for the jailer at Philippi; for the elect lady, as for widow Dorcas; for the lord treasurer of Ethiopia, as for the beggar at the Beautiful gate of the temple; for the household of Cæsar, as for the household of Stephanas: yea, and if he will, for King Agrippa too . . . as, indeed, I know none so rich but needs these tidings; all to feel the want of them in their spirits; no *dicis quia dives sum*; as few sparks of the Pharisee as may be, in them that will be interested in it."'

III.

And if considerateness is good for the conduct of public worship and good for the preacher, it is good also for the everyday life of the pastor. The Bishop of Durham remembers a conversation a few years ago 'with one of our college servants, an excellent Christian woman, truly exemplary in every duty. She was speaking of one of my dear student friends now labouring for the Lord in a distant and difficult mission-field, and giving him—after his departure from us—a tribute of most disinterested praise: "Ah, Sir, he *was* a consistent gentleman!" And then she instanced some of my friend's consistencies; and I observed that they all reduced themselves to one word—Considerateness. He was always taking trouble, and always saving trouble. He was always finding out how a little thought for others can save them much needless labour. The things in question were not heroic. The thoughtfulness for others concerned only such matters as the bath, and the shoes, and the clothes, and some small details of hospitality. But they meant a very great deal for the hard-worked caretaker, and they were to her a means of quite distinct "edification," upbuilding, in the assurance that Christ and the Gospel are indeed practical realities.'

Dr. Moule adds: 'I break no confidence when I add, by the way, that my friend had not always been thus "a consistent gentleman." But the Lord had found him, and he had found the Lord, in the midst of his University life; and he had learnt most deeply and effectually, at the feet of Jesus, the consistency of Considerateness.'

That is the secret. 'Behold, God is mighty, and despiseth not any; for that he is great in heart.' The man who has made that discovery has the 'capacity of penetrating to the hidden man of the heart, recognizing and bringing to light the inward goodness which an uncouth exterior or a repellent manner had concealed. He evinces a delicate courtesy, an almost instinctive understanding of what another means and would be, a wise considerateness. He realizes, too, and very clearly, the value of things that appear to be trivial. Brother Lawrence was accustomed to say, "You can pick up a straw for the love of God." You may do even as small a thing for the love of man. He who is immersed in the Spirit will measure every earthly thing with the reed of the sanctuary; he will discern the unseen magnitudes which reveal the relation of the simplest deeds to the things that are above. The cup of cold water, the kindly human word, the touch of a brother's hand, faith's two mites offered in love, are infinite in worth and measureless in reward.'

'One autumn afternoon,' says the Rev. D. M. M'Intyre, 'I was returning from the funeral of an aged country minister, who had lived for half a century in a lonely parish in Scotland on the edge of the moorland. A white-headed man came up to me, and told me, as well as he could for weeping, how more than fifty years before, he had been a herd-lad in that parish. My friend had then come, fresh from college, to be ordained to the charge which he was to hold until his death. One evening, as he walked down the road beside the field where this lad was herding, the cows

"tigged"—started, and ran—and the young minister came at once to the help of the half-distracted child, gathered the cows back, waited until they became quiet, then proceeded on his solitary walk. Probably he was thinking of the charge laid on him, and the work which had been given him to do for God, and after a few minutes would possibly dismiss from his mind this mere incident. But the boy never forgot. It was more to him than all the preaching and visiting that followed. It was that, more than anything else, which seemed to hold him to God and to God's minister; and as he told me of it after all that space of years, the big tears were raining down into the dust, and his voice choked and broke. To the minister that which he did that evening may well have seemed a little thing; to the lad it was as if the hand of Christ had been laid on him in blessing.'

SOME TOPICS.

Action.

Lady Ritchie's Memories, entitled *From Friend to Friend* (Murray; 6s. net), are good for two or three hours of quiet reading and enjoyment. She tells happy stories of the life of Fanny and Adelaide Kemble, of Tennyson and Mrs. Cameron (the gifted generous friend of the Tennysons), of her own father (W. M. Thackeray), and of others.

Her father took her to a Shakespearian Reading by Mrs. Fanny Kemble. 'As we came away he once more broke into praise. "Don't you see how admirably she forgets herself?" he said; "how she flings herself into it all? how finely she feels it?"' That is an added note to the paper on Action in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for February.

Whitaker.

The fifty-second annual volume of *Whitaker's Almanack* 'marks the centenary of the birth of its projector.' It also marks the entry of new nations, and 'New articles deal with Arabia, German Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Yugo-Slavia, with outline maps in the text. Maps have also been added to the articles on Germany, Turkey, and Denmark, and an attempt has been made to represent the existing state of affairs in the various Russian Republics, and to describe the potentialities of the Arctic *El Dorado* in Spitsbergen. The terms of the Treaties of Versailles, St. Germain, and Neuilly, and the Covenant of the League of Nations, are also included.' A new section deals with 'Questions of the Day.' What are the questions of the day? They are Women's War Work, the Professions open to Women, Women Police, and Workmen's Compensation, and on all these questions Whitaker for 1920 contains special articles. One thing is unexpectedly omitted. The Temperance (Scotland) Act comes into operation this year. A summary of its provisions with instructions to voters would have been very useful.

Inspiration.

What is the particular adjective which you use to describe the inspiration of the Bible? Verbal? We received a few weeks ago a monthly magazine in which the verbal inspiration of the Bible was spoken of as if it were as certain as a demonstration in geometry. Plenary? That was a blessed word once, but it seems to have lost its charm. Moral? Dynamical? Vital? Dr. George Hodges, Dean of the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, prefers 'vital.'

Dr. Hodges has written a popular and progressive book on the Bible. *How to know the Bible* he calls it (Skeffington; 6s. net). What he says about Inspiration will let us understand the kind of man he is and the kind of book he has written:

'In the lives of some men there are moments of unusual vision and exaltation. Into this experience even ordinary persons enter in times of exceeding emotion, but it is the special privilege of those whose difference from the common run of men is called genius. In such moments they see visions of truth and beauty, and hear voices which bring answers to ancient problems. They are unable to give prose accounts of these experiences. They come out of the silence into the street, and, if they attempt to describe what happened to them, they say that they heard the blowing of a mighty wind, and saw the flames of mystic fires; or some such thing. St. Paul, to whom this happened many times, confessed that whether he was in the body or out of the body, he could not tell. All that he knew was that he was caught up to the third heaven, and "heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." That was his way of expressing it. Bezaleel and Aholiab, inspired craftsmen, would

no doubt have expressed it differently; so too would Gideon and Jephthah, inspired captains. But in all cases it is essentially the same thing. Men are conscious of an impartation and impulse from without. They are lifted above their ordinary selves. Suddenly, the world about them is illuminated, as by a flash of lightning in the dark, and they know where they are, and what things mean, and where to go, and what to do. They come out, and write a poem, or a sermon, or a chapter of a book, or they build a house or a bridge, or paint a picture, or make a new plan of compaign, or put a new resolution into effect.

'For this vital inspiration, as the Bible itself suggests, is not peculiar to religion. Neither is it essentially different in religion from what it is in other fields of life. People used to ask, when this doctrine was debated, how the inspiration of Isaiah differed from the inspiration of Shakespeare or of St. Augustine. There was never any very satisfactory answer. It was like asking how the genius of the one differed from the genius of the others. The "spirit of God," as it says in the Old Testament, was upon them all: also upon Michael Angelo and Raphael, upon Copernicus and Newton, upon Washington and Lincoln. Each of these men was so uncommonly filled with power, or with wisdom, or with insight, or with the knowledge of the truth, that he perceived, and his neighbours perceived also, that he was moved of God. That seemed the most direct and simple explanation. The divine impulse and the divine guidance did not relieve them from the necessity of work, neither did it insure them against making mistakes; neither did it obliterate their individuality, rather it emphasized it. What it did was so to vitalize them, so to enrich and strengthen their souls, that they were able to do great deeds, and to think great thoughts. These men, whether they wrote books of the Bible, or built churches, or ruled states, or made any other contribution to the progress of the world, were inspired of God.'

POETRY.

Margaret Cavendish.

An addition has been made to the 'Golden Treasury Series.' It is *A Treasury of Seventeenth Century English Verse*, from the Death of Shakespeare to the Restoration (1616–1660), chosen and edited by H. J. Massingham (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net). The poems are arranged in the alphabetical order of their author's names. And so, pretty early comes Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, with this reflexion on the Soul's Raiment:

Great Nature clothes the soul, which is but thin,
With fleshly garments, which the Fates do spin,
And when these garments are grown old and bare,
With sickness torn, Death takes them off with care.
And folds them up in peace and quiet rest,
And lays them safe within an earthly chest:
Then scours them well and makes them sweet
and clean.
Fit for the soul to wear those clothes again.

There are many other poems as happy in thought and expression in the three hundred and ninety-nine which the little volume contains. And besides the poems there is Mr. Massingham's Introduction and Notes. Here is the note on the poem just quoted and its author: 'If this poem were not short, the idea would be elaborated until it was worn as threadbare as the fleshy garments. The Duchess of Newcastle never lets well alone in her verse. She likes to think of a number, double, treble, quadruple it and conclude that the poetic vision is captured by the big battalions. As it is, it is a fine success.

'The Duchess of Newcastle's biography of her husband is of course an English classic, even though Pepys called her "a mad, conceited, ridiculous woman" and the Duke "an ass to suffer her to write what she writes to him and of him." Lamb's criticism is well known—"No casket is rich enough, no casing sufficiently durable to honour and keep such a jewel." She wrote thirteen volumes, all her works are in folio, and she left a mass of manuscript. The reason why so much of it is unreadable is given in her own words—"That little wit I have, it delights me to scribble it out and to disperse it about,"—for the vanity and lax expansiveness of the self-exploiting amateur are what posterity condemns in her. Nevertheless, if one has the patience to wade through the lake-like sweep of shallow water to its brook-source, there is much homely wit and sensible housewifely counsel on life. The "Life" is a work of noble quality and naive charm. But on the whole, this famous Duchess was a blue-stocking who not only made the most, but a success of it.'

R. L. Gales.

The war has bitten deep into the soul of that passionate poet, R. L. Gales. His *Skylark and Swallow* (Erskine Macdonald; 5s. net) is hard reading, but all discipline is hard. The last poem in the book is an oath:

THE OATH.

By these unnumbered foully slain
We will not rest, we swear,
Till Freedom, unto eyes that weep,
That Sight so fair,
Arises deathless from the deep
Of our despair;
Till night falls on the dotard lords
And vampire kings,
Till all the sceptres and the swords
Are broken things;
Till babes are born into the world
Not cannon-food from birth,
Till all the mirage of our dreams
Is solid earth.

Agnes Lee.

Agnes Lee is but one of the hundred and fifty poets of the present day who are represented in *New Voices* (Macmillan; $2). But it is a poem by her that we propose to quote, and so we give her name the honour. The editor of the volume is Marguerite Wilkinson, a well-known critic of poetry and encourager of poets. The editor divides her poets and poems (they are British as well as American) into classes according to their prevailing subject. Some write mostly of Love, some of Religion, some of Children, some of Nature. But some are Radical and some Conservative, and they also are gathered together according to their taste or training. Every chapter is introduced with an essay by the editor, and then follow the selected poems. We like the poems better than the essays. We did not think that so many of such real excellence could have been brought together out of this century's work. It is a great feast. And it is the more enjoyable that every dish is quite digestible, which is to say that every poem is quite intelligible. And now for the example. It is called

MOTHERHOOD.

Mary, the Christ long slain, passed silently,
Following the children joyously astir
Under the cedrus and the olive-tree,
Pausing to let their laughter float to her.
Each voice an echo of a voice more dear,
She saw a little Christ in every face;
When lo, another woman, gliding near,
Yearned o'er the tender life that filled the place.
And Mary sought the woman's hand, and spoke:
'I know thee not, yet know thy memory tossed
With all a thousand dreams their eyes evoke
Who bring to thee a child beloved and lost.

'I, too, have rocked my little one.
Oh, He was fair!
Yea, fairer than the fairest sun,
And like its rays through amber spun
His sun-bright hair.
Still I can see it shine and shine.'
'Even so,' the woman said, 'was mine.'

'His ways were ever darling ways'—
And Mary smiled—
'So soft, so clinging! Glad relays
Of love were all His precious days.
My little child!
My infinite star! My music fled!'
'Even so was mine,' the woman said.

Then whispered Mary: 'Tell me, thou,
Of thine.' And she:
'Oh, mine was rosy as a bough
Blooming with roses, sent, somehow,
To bloom for me!
His balmy fingers left a thrill
Within my breast that warms me still.'

Then gazed she down some wilder, darker hour,
And said—when Mary questioned, knowing not:
'Who art thou, mother of so sweet a flower?'—
'I am the mother of Iscariot.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON has published the Sermons and Addresses which he delivered between Easter 1918 and Easter 1919. They have all to do with the War and what the War has left us. He calls the book *Victory and After* (Wells Gardner; 3s. net).

In one of the sermons Dr. INGRAM recognizes the duty of the Church, now that the War is over, of concentrating upon the Re-evangelization of England. It is the Archbishop of Canterbury's Report on the Evangelistic Work of the Church that has made him recognize it. And with his usual plainness of speech he says that the way to re-evangelize England is to convert the men and women that are in it. He does not seem to think that their need of conversion will be disputed. He takes that for granted, and he makes no exception. He proceeds at once to tell us what they have to be converted to.

They have to be converted to childlikeness. His text is, 'Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye cannot enter the kingdom of heaven' (Mt 18^3). And he tells us what childlikeness is.

There are certain characteristics, he tells us, which belong to children. These characteristics must be ours if we are to enter the kingdom. What are the characteristics of a little child?

They are Arbitrariness, Attractiveness, Catholicity, Charity (Love), Cheerfulness, Confidence, Criticism, Curiosity, Dependence, Directness, Docility, Earnestness, Expectation, Experimentalism, Faith, Fear, Fearlessness, Frankness, Helplessness, Hero-worship, Humility, Humour, Imaginativeness, Imitativeness, Immediateness, Impressionableness, Innocence, Joy, Justice, Modesty, Obedience, Observation, Receptiveness, Religiousness, Repentance, Resignation, Responsiveness, Restlessness, Sensitiveness, Simplicity, Sincerity, Sorrow, Spontaneousness, Supernaturalism, Trustfulness, Weakness, Wonder.

Is it a long list? It could be lengthened. Why is it so long? We shall answer that in a moment. But first of all let us glance at the distribution of it.

Who suggests Arbitrariness, Imaginativeness, and Experimentalism as the characteristics of childhood? Who but Canon Scott Holland, with more than the memories of childhood fresh upon him, with childhood its very self remaining with him all through life. He names those characteristics, and then he says: 'All this is what childhood means. This is its charm, its glory.'

And it is the more charming in himself because he thinks he has left all this behind him. For he names those characteristics, not in a sermon on the entrance into the Kingdom, but in a sermon on St. Paul's declaration that he had passed from childhood into manhood. When 'I was a child . . . but now.' St. Paul *has* left his childhood behind him. 'It is past and over, that delicious day of expansion and ease and splendid illusions.' But Canon Scott Holland never left it behind him. And when in another volume he tells us seriously that the characteristics of the Child of the Kingdom are Wonder and Trust, we are not disturbed. We go back to the charm and the glory of the child—Arbitrariness, Imaginativeness, and Experimentalism.

Principal Rainy was more like St. Paul. 'When I became a man, I put away childish things.' 'Some of us have come a good way from the country where the little children dwell; but, by remembrance or by observation, we still know something about it.' By observation, more than by remembrance. You have read his biography. You remember his emphatic 'Oh, man, I'm happy at home!' when they wondered that he could bear the persistent nagging of the newspapers. What did he see at home? Responsiveness, Spontaneousness, Impressionableness, Expectation, and Obedience.

In the first series of his *Essays on Some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion*, Archbishop Whately has an essay 'On the Example of Children as Proposed to Christians.' It is stately and slow, very philosophical and very heavy. 'The subject is naturally divided into two branches; first, our analogy to children in respect of the *knowledge* we possess; and, secondly, in respect of *duties*—of the rules of conduct we may derive from contemplating the condition of childhood.' When at last he comes to contemplate the condition of childhood, he finds that children are 'held out to our imitation' because of their Humility, their Docility, and their Resignation. We shall return to Whately.

If Whately is the philosopher, Ruskin is the artist. But take an expositor or two between. Bishop Chadwick, like Archbishop Whately, begins with Humility—we shall see why. He adds only Dependence. Adolph Saphir, has a longer list—Docility, Earnestness, Frankness, Helplessness, Immediateness, Justice. The surprise is Immediateness. 'A child,' he says, '*lives in the present.* It is not anxious for the morrow. A disappointment does not crush it; it springs back again, because the undercurrent of its life is joy and confidence.' Justice also we have not seen before. 'Tell a child a story in which the wicked go unpunished, and it is disappointed; its tiny conscience rebels.'

When we come to Ruskin we encounter a difficulty. Are we speaking of the child as it is, or as it ought to be? Canon Scott Holland took it as it is—arbitrary, imaginative, experimental. Ruskin takes it as it ought to be. He speaks of 'right childhood,' and in the next sentence of 'a well-bred child.' We shall deal with that difficulty also in a moment. Meantime Ruskin's list is Humility, Faith, Charity, and Cheerfulness. And for him it is evident that the greatest of these is Cheerfulness. 'You hear much of conversion now-a-days: but people always seem to think they have got to be made wretched by conversion,—to be converted to long faces. No, friends, you have got to be converted to short ones; you have to repent into childhood, to repent into delight and delightsomeness.'

Another list will be enough. It is Blake's, and it is surely the most wonderful of all. It is not found solemnly set forth in the firstly, secondly, thirdly of a preacher. It had to be gathered from his poetry with care. Berger has gathered it.

'If we wish'—this is Berger—'if we wish to give a definition of childhood as Blake saw it, we can only arrive at it by a progressive elimination of psychological characteristics. The mystic's vision never grasps the whole complex nature of living

reality; and Blake perceived in childhood only two or three very simple fundamental traits. We can never understand him if we say, with La Bruyère, that children are already men; for it is only when they grow up that they become men, and as yet they have not lived at all. We must, on the contrary, go close to their cradle. "There is a time," says this same La Bruyère, "when reason does not yet exist, when we only live by instinct, like the animals; and of this time we can remember nothing." It is to this time that we must carry ourselves back. We shall find all our lost memories of it reflected in Blake's vision; and that animal instinct which La Bruyère seems to despise is, in Blake's eyes, a spark of the eternal fire. No wonder, then, that he saw in childhood the realization of his ideal of Eternity, as far as it could be realized on earth.'

Then Berger gives the list. 'The elements that combine to form this ideal are, seemingly, very few. They are: perfect happiness, resulting from ignorance of all evil; perfect innocence, which is chiefly due to the absence of any restrictive law; unhindered communion between the child's own life and that of the animals and the things that surround it; and, lastly, the clear vision of the divine world, and of those spiritual beings who are always ready to protect and love the child. All these elements are very simple. They are seen intuitively; felt rather than analysed by Blake, and expressed in a language which is as simple as his conception of them.'

Now the thing that surprises us most in these lists of the characteristics of little children is the prominence given to Humility. For Humility is not a characteristic of childhood. The association is absurd. What is the explanation of its recurrence? Whately begins with it; so does Chadwick; and Professor J. E. B. Mayor (whose list we have not quoted). Others give it a place, though not the first, as if they felt that it must come in, though not very clearly a characteristic of the childhood that they know.

The explanation is quite simple. They begin with Humility, or give it a place, because they read that Christ said, 'Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven' (Mt 18^4). Professor Mayor quotes this passage, and then says: 'The disciples, fishermen and publicans, had been quarrelling for a high place (as they thought) in a king's palace; they were to become like children, who know nothing of these names; for the king's son will play with the beggar child.' Is that our Lord's meaning? Let us understand.

Our Lord had to do with two classes of persons —those who had gone wrong and knew it, and those who had gone wrong but did not know it, or at least did not acknowledge it. The one class He called Sinners, the other Righteous—accepting, no doubt, names which were already in use. Upon both classes He pressed one thing and one thing only—return. They had gone wrong, both had gone wrong, whether they acknowledged it or not; they had to come back and begin again.

He had most difficulty with the Righteous. Working along the lines of the Law, with more or less fidelity, they had built up a character for religiousness which was accepted by the multitude —accepted apparently for much more than it was worth. It was peculiarly difficult for them to forfeit their good name, admit their imperfections, more than that their utter failure, and begin life again on wholly different lines. Yet that, and nothing less than that, was what they had to do.

The clearest case is Nicodemus. He came to Jesus by night. We do not know why he chose the darkness to come, but we do know why he came. He came to Jesus by night to see if there was any omission in his righteous observance of the Mosaic Law. Like that other Ruler, and apparently younger man, he had kept all these things from his youth up—*what lacked he yet?*

Jesus answered, and said unto him, 'Except a man *be born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' It is not something lacking; it is everything wrong. He had been building up a house of outward observance—a new Tower of Babel, to reach to heaven before he died, and he was told that it had all to come down. He had been living a life of righteous merit without the spirit that makes the motive right. He was told that he must be born again.

Were the disciples Righteous or Sinners? It really does not matter. The necessity of being born again is on both. This is the necessity which our Lord laid upon them, though the words are a little different in St. Matthew. He said they must be converted—they must convert, turn about, as the true translation is—and become as little children. He told them, as He told Nicodemus, that they had to begin at the very beginning.

Now when He said, as in the passage which we are considering, 'Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child,' He did not mean to say, and He did not say, that the child is humble. The child is not humble. What He said was that they were to come down from the height of their manhood and become as little children. It was to be a humbling enough experience. And it would be only the more humbling that their manhood at the moment was expressing itself in a dispute as to which of them should be greatest.

This, then, is the first characteristic of the Child of the Kingdom. He is a beginner. He *is* a child.

He is not a child physically. Ruskin has settled that. 'Not of children themselves,' he says, 'but of such as children. I believe most mothers who read that text think that all heaven, or the earth—when it gets to be like heaven—is to be full of babies. But that's not so. "Length of days and long life and peace," that is the blessing; not to die, still less to live, in babyhood.'

And he is not a child mentally. St. Paul has settled that. 'When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things' (1 Co 13^{11}). St. Paul, interpreted by Canon Scott Holland, has settled it: 'Childhood foresees infinite possibilities, and refuses to limit its aims, and is endlessly irrational, and incalculable, and wilful, and arbitrary, and sudden, and abrupt, and freakish, and whimsical. It surrenders itself to fancies and feelings; and it requires a wide area in which to disport, with abundance of opportunities.'

'And all this St. Paul has left behind him. If we look for any of this in him we shall find none of it. It is past and over, that delicious day of expansion and ease and splendid illusions. He had had it once—thanks be to God! There was a time (how well he remembers it!) when that happy liberty had been his. He had thought as a child thinks, had spoken as a child speaks, had understood as only a child understands. But now, as we first know him, he has come through it; he has stripped himself of its beautiful gifts, of all those privileges, those endearments, those fascinations, which are the heritage of children, for which we love them so. They are gone. He has not been afraid to put them aside. For he has become "a man."'

'A man! He is a man, in that, looking all round, reviewing the entire area of possibilities over which youth had vaguely experimented, he has by a motive of victorious will, strung into activity by grace, made his one overmastering, absorbing, irrevocable choice of what he will do with himself and his life. He has gathered his whole being together, drawn in upon itself all the loose and unhindered expansiveness of childhood, and deliberately, in vigorous consciousness, with precise intention, committed himself to a selected career. He has withheld nothing from that act of choice. He can never go back on it. He has "burnt his boats." Every fragment of his life to-

come must take its colour from that imperious decision. By it he is made or marred for ever. Right on, into the eternity beyond death, he will still be stamped with its brand. He will be the man who pledged himself in that fashion; who sent his whole self down that channel; who made that great and final committal.'

That is Scott Holland. And it is true. It is true and wonderful for a man who never left his own childhood behind him. But the point for us is that the Child of the Kingdom is not a child mentally.

No, the Child of the Kingdom is not a child physically or mentally. He is a child spiritually. He is 'born of the Spirit.' Not that the Spirit of God is more available now than when he was born of the flesh, but that *he* is more responsive. It is not the child, whether as it is or as it ought to be, that is greatest in the Kingdom, it is he who responds most utterly to the approach of the Spirit of God, surrendering the old life with its sin and its righteousness and beginning anew.

Surrendering the old life—in that lies the difficulty. And it is more difficult for the Righteous than for the Sinners. 'The publicans and harlots enter the kingdom of heaven before you.' Nor was it ever more difficult than now. For never was righteousness more truly righteous, never respectability more respectable. So subtle has self-righteousness (for it *is* self-righteousness) grown that we cannot believe the pharisees of our Lord's condemnation to have been so pharisaical. But we have to give it all up and begin again.

'There is a state of mind,' says William James, 'known to religious men, but to no others, in which the will to assert ourselves and hold our own has been displaced by a willingness to close our mouths and be as nothing in the floods and waterspouts of God. In this state of mind, what we most dreaded has become the habitation of our safety, and the hour of our moral death has turned into our spiritual birthday. The time for tension in our soul is over, and that of happy relaxation, of calm deep breathing, of an eternal present, with no discordant future to be anxious about, has arrived. Fear is not held in abeyance as it is by mere morality, it is positively expunged and washed away.'

Surrender—that is the first of the characteristics of the Child of the Kingdom of Heaven. If he has been a sinner and acknowledges it, the surrender will be called Repentance, and it will be followed by restitution—'If I have taken anything from any man.' If he has been a sinner and does not acknowledge it, the surrender will still be called Repentance. In the one case it is the surrender of open and acknowledged sin; in the other of open righteousness, with the acknowledgment of sin also at the last, and again with restitution—'Ye devour widows' houses.'

Then will appear some of the characteristics of the little child, the very characteristics which make the child so charming. And first of all simple, affectionate Trust.

'For, if you will think of it,'—this is Rainy, and at his very best,—'what mainly makes the grace of childhood? Is it not this, that the child being set in a world of persons and forces, far stronger than itself,—beyond its grasp and reach,—to which notwithstanding in the very roots of its being it is related,—this being so, all is happily adjusted by the presence of great and strong affections, which bring everything into sympathy and rest, into happy and hopeful life? But, is not that just *Christianity*?—*we* find ourselves in a world how great, high, far reaching — in which wonderful affections on God's side and, through His grace, on ours come in to bless us? It is so; but how truly we hardly guess. In this direction Christianity has secrets we have but partially found out as yet. Let this be believed. Some know much,

perhaps, of the dust and toil of conflict; of the weariness of the way, in the great enterprise of walking with God; of the pain of loss; but when we are fighting and burdened, what is it about after all? Is it not about realizing Christ in His grace and help; is it not about retaining faith and hope and love? But in holding on to these it is the child nature and the child destiny we are holding on to—not that which has passed away, but that which is coming, that happiness and freedom the secret and security of which are God Himself.'

Next, Receptiveness—the receptiveness of the unspoilt child. How receptive children are, 'how ready to receive, to take quickly with open hand whatever you have to give, never fancying they must give something in return. People grow away from that. "I take nothing that I don't pay for; I'm obliged to nobody; I give as much as I get and keep square accounts."' We have to return from that. We have to begin again.

And then Obedience—the readiness to do as well as the willingness to receive. Archbishop Temple tells us that 'it is natural and easy to a child to obey.' He must have known only Ruskin's 'well-bred child.' The ready obedience of the well-bred child is as charming as any characteristic that childhood offers us. But 'it will be obvious,' says Dr. F. R. Tennant, 'that the sin which is most likely to beset the child most importunately at the commencement of its moral life must be disobedience.' And Professor Sully tells us why: 'He is full of fun, bent on his harmless tricks. He has a number of inconvenient, active impulses, such as putting things in disorder, playing with water, and so forth. As we all know, he has a duck-like fondness for dirty puddles. Civilization, which wills that a child should be nicely dressed and clean, intervenes in the shape of the nurse and soon puts a stop to this mode of diversion. The tyro in submission, if sound in brain and limb, kicks against the restraint, yells, slaps the nurse, and so forth.'

But the Child of the Kingdom is a well-bred child; he has learned obedience. Like the Saviour Himself he learns it by the things which he suffers. How often has he to say, 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not my will, but thine be done.' Whereupon he is well on the way to bring forth, not the characteristics which give the charm to the little child, but the fruits of the Spirit, which make the charm of the Child of the Kingdom. For the fruits of the Spirit are these —love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance.

Nevertheless, it is not to be denied, rather is it gladly to be acknowledged, that in those who are most manifestly bringing forth the fruits of the Spirit, there often remains a certain childlikeness, which is truly attractive and truly consistent with Christian manhood. Sir James G. Frazer, in relaxation from the writing of books about the 'Golden Bough,' has been visiting Coverley Hall, the residence of Addison's Sir Roger de Coverley. Searching in the archives of the Spectator Club, he came upon some manuscripts which *The Spectator* had either rejected or perhaps kept by him on the chance of their serving as stop-gaps when he had nothing better to offer for the entertainment of the day, and selected four for publication. And this is what we read about Sir Roger in one of them: 'The longer I stay at the Hall, the more I love its master. For there is about him a sweet simplicity, a sort of childlike frankness and innocence, which wonderfully pleases me and puts me many times in mind of Our Saviour's words, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." I think I never met one who seemed to me to need less preparation for death and for that communion with the spirits of the just made perfect, to which Scripture teaches us to look forward as a principal source of the happiness that awaits us in the life hereafter. Not that Sir Roger is either very wise or very witty; for in truth he is neither, unless, as I am sometimes prone to think, the greatest wisdom consists in the greatest purity

of the heart, for judged by that standard I would be bold to match Sir Roger against Socrates or any sage in history.'

Perhaps Sir Roger de Coverley is not wise enough for our purpose. Take a wise man, then. Take the successful Headmaster of a great Public School, Dr. Edward Carus Selwyn. His biography has just been written. We read: 'There was always in him something of the child. It showed itself in his fun, his simplicity, his ready appreciation of things and people. And all this was the more marked and the more charming in one of his intellectual distinction and with his always stimulating though often combative or provocative ideas. Truly a most lovable man, who had never lost the freshness and unexpectedness of a child.'

Finally we will remember that Elizabeth Barrett Browning made it her prayer—the most ambitious prayer she could put into poetry—that the newly born child might retain its childhood to the end:

Therefore no song of mine,—
But prayer in place of singing; prayer that would
Commend thee to the new-creating God,
Whose gift is childhood's heart without its stain
Of weakness, ignorance, and changing vain—
That gift of God be thine!

So wilt thou aye be young,
In lovelier childhood than thy shining brow
And pretty winning accents make thee now.
Yea, sweeter than this scarce articulate sound
(How sweet!) of 'Father,' 'Mother,' shall be found
The ABBA on thy tongue.

And so, as years shall chase
Each other's shadows, thou wilt less resemble
Thy fellows of the earth who toil and tremble,
Than him thou seest not, thine angel bold
Yet meek, whose ever-lifted eyes behold
The Ever-loving's face.

Having written the Notes on the Child of the Kingdom, we returned to the reading of Harold BEGBIE'S *Life of William Booth, the Founder of the Salvation Army* (Macmillan; 2 vols., 42s. net). Immediately (for we had reached the middle of the second volume, reading with great enjoyment), we came upon this: 'I do not know whether it was the mention of religious books that led to it, but Mr. Gladstone remarked with some emphasis, that there was nothing that surprised him more than the objection he found running through many religious works to what was described as "Self-righteousness."'

The sentence occurs in the report of a conversation between Mr. Gladstone and General Booth, which took place at Hawarden in 1896. The report proceeds: 'While I cannot understand,' said Mr. Gladstone, 'how any man with any true knowledge of his heart, or of his life, or of the Holy God whom he worships, can possibly conceive that anything he can think, or feel, or say, or do, can be deemed worthy of presentation before Him, as constituting any meritorious ground on which to claim His favour, I do think that, instead of condemning righteousness, in any form, its cultivation should be encouraged, and its all-important need insisted upon.'

Now Mr. Gladstone was undoubtedly correct when he said that the objection to self-righteousness runs through many religious works. But one of these works is the Bible. If the writers of modern religious works object to self-righteousness, they never feel the objection more keenly or express it more vigorously than St. Paul. And St. Paul was undoubtedly in this respect at one with his Master.

It is truly surprising that Mr. Gladstone, who read the Bible regularly, did not remember that. But this is not the only surprise. Immediately afterwards, we see, he confounded self-righteousness with righteousness. 'I do think that, instead of condemning righteousness, in any form, its

cultivation should be encouraged.' Who condemns righteousness? Who condemns it in any form?

Certainly not St. Paul, and certainly not our Lord. 'Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, If thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments.' There is no condemnation of righteousness in that. No more is there condemnation of righteousness in St. Paul, or in any 'religious work' worth mentioning.

But when a man assumes that he is righteous, or even honestly believes that he is righteous, when he is not, that man's righteousness is condemned at once, and ought to be condemned, both in the Bible and in every other 'religious work.'

And we must go further than that. We must ask what righteousness is. It is harmony with God. The man who is in harmony with God is a righteous man; the man who is out of harmony with God is not righteous. We miss that essential fact by separating righteousness from holiness. Holiness, we say, is our attitude to God, righteousness is our attitude to man. The separation is false. It is even foolish. We cannot be right with man unless we are right with God. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself'—it is not two separate commandments side by side, it is one commandment, the last half of it issuing inevitably and indissolubly out of the first.

The question accordingly is this: Can a man obtain harmony with God, or can he even maintain it by his own righteous acts or life? The answer is obvious. Any man who thinks that he can is mistaken. If he is doing righteous deeds he is to that extent a righteous man, and no 'religious work' will condemn his righteousness. But if he believes that his righteous deeds are good enough and numerous enough to bring him into harmony with God or keep him there, he is self-righteous, and (to use the emphatic language of our Lord) 'is condemned already.'

How like a mere theological logomachy it looks. How impatient with it is the man in the street. How ignorant of it is the reader of 'many religious works.' Yet how fundamental it is, how utterly essential, to religion and to life.

For it is not merely a matter of degree. It is not that the righteous man is not righteous enough. Certainly he is not righteous enough, and cannot be. When the rich young Ruler said, 'All these have I kept from my youth up,' Jesus did not contradict him. He simply told him that it was not enough. 'If thou wouldest be perfect, go sell that thou hast, and give to the poor.' For nothing is enough that is short of perfection. Imperfect harmony is not harmony with God.

But it is more than that. Not one single righteous act of the righteous man is righteous enough. It does not make him right with God—not even at the moment. It does not make him right with man. 'All these have I kept'—'Go sell that thou hast, and give to the poor.' In order that a single righteous act may be righteous enough it must have in it the whole power of love. Now we love because He first loved us. And it is only when we cast ourselves on the love of God, and allow the love of God to work in us and through us—it is only then that we can do one righteous deed. What doth the Lord require of us, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with our God? Nothing else. But we cannot do one of these things unless the love of Christ—not our love to Him but His love in us—constrains us.

The Gospel of Power.[1]

By the Reverend William Fulton, B.D., B.Sc., Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Aberdeen.

Power.

Christianity is essentially a religion of power. The New Testament bears ample evidence of it. Power is present like the freshness of the morning, power throbs and surges like the energy of the springtime, in all its pages. By the power divine sin is conquered, darkness dispelled, and the inward man renewed day by day. And it is all traced back to that great and notable day of the Lord, that day of days in the spiritual history of mankind, when the Holy Spirit descended upon the waiting disciples of Jesus, and conviction burned and glowed within their hearts, and Simon Peter, not timid now nor fearful, stood up with the eleven and spoke that bold resounding sentence which is the veritable foundation-rock of the Christian Church: *Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.*

In the power of the Holy Spirit the Lord Jesus Christ still upbuilds the Church. Still does He redeem, enlighten, and renew; still is He a fountain of life within, welling up in refreshing, fertilizing streams. The energy of Pentecost is not exhausted, the gifts of Pentecost are poured out freely.

I am sure many of you who have been attending these meetings could testify to the truth of this. You could say, as you look back upon the experience of the week, 'There, and there, and there, I felt the unseen world upon me, and power from on high touched and uplifted my soul.' And you could further testify, that though the gift is poured out freely, it takes hearts of faith to receive it. For it is no external and mechanical relation, the relation between the life of God and the soul of man. It is inward, vital, and in a sense mystical, and unless we learn, like the disciples of old, to wait upon God in faith, in the spirit of trust and self-surrender, we have no right to be expectant of His heavenly gifts.

Think what an enrichment of character and life came to the disciples as they waited for the promise of the Spirit. The Peter of Pentecost was a very different man from the Peter of the Passover, so strong and self-possessed now, so clear-sighted as to the things of God and His Kingdom; and the other disciples, who forsook Jesus at Gethsemane and fled,—in a few short weeks they are found rejoicing to be beaten and imprisoned for His sake, and to be counted worthy of shame and death.

And what different men and women we might become, if only we could draw nearer to God in Jesus Christ and open our hearts to receive His gifts. Our lives would be lifted out of their narrowness and meanness, and would reveal a new and more spacious quality. We should learn to venture unhesitatingly upon broad expanses of duty, we should be freemen in the high realms of truth, we should sound the depths of generous feeling, unafraid to love, and to suffer too, for love's sake.

Wherefore yield yourselves, O men and women, to the Spirit of the living Christ; yield yourselves to Him in faith and humble trust, and He shall accomplish His own most gracious work upon you.

Service.

So far I have tried to say that to-day, as in the early days of the Church, Christianity is essentially and fundamentally a religion of power; the power, namely, of the Holy Spirit, bestowed on them that faithfully wait. That power, I have also tried to say, we must appropriate in fuller measure if our lives are to be ennobled and enriched, and in the unknown future days to enter into larger places. Which leads me now to say that spiritual power is not an end in itself: the gospel of power issues in the life of service.

For their sakes I sanctify, or better, *I consecrate myself*,—there in one pregnant sentence is the secret of our Lord's life; and it should remind us, if in these days reminder were needed, that spiritual power, the power that comes of consecration, is—as Phillips Brooks once said—not a luxury but a force, to be applied therefore and utilized. The vision on the mount prepares for duty in the plain, and in the sombre valleys. The fellowship of the

[1] An address delivered at a Convention for the Strengthening of the Religious Life held in Aberdeen in September 1919.

upper room gives strength for the carrying of the Cross, yea, even on to Calvary. And the Cross remains indeed the true symbol of our Christian religion,—the Cross of service and sacrifice, and not the mountain-top or the upper room.

There are some who deprecate the new emphasis laid upon the idea of service in the doctrine of the Christian life. Their sympathies are with the traditional individualism, according to which a man's chief business is to keep and save his own soul. I should be the last to minimize the idea of a personal salvation, but yet I rejoice that the idea of social salvation is at length coming to its own. In no previous age have the needs and problems of the social world been so keenly felt and so earnestly faced; and in no previous age, unless perhaps the apostolic age, has Christianity been drawn so strongly, with so strong a magnetism, towards the pole of humanity and social service. The true salvation of the individual is more and more recognized as not apart from the salvation of society. The more a man merges his life in the life and well-being of others, he receives it back again the richer, fuller, and nobler. In doing good he becomes good. In renouncing he comes to himself, in sacrificing he realizes himself. In saving others he saves himself. It is part of the grand truth of the social nature of personality; a truth which modern knowledge has enriched and enlarged, but whose essential significance was understood long ago by One who said, *He that loseth his life shall find it.*

Witness.

There is one word associated in the New Testament with power in the light of which I would set the duty and obligation of Christian service. It is the word *witness.* The gospel of power carries with it the obligation of witness; more specifically, of bearing witness unto Christ.

You know how faithfully the apostles and their successors fulfilled that obligation. In a few centuries the gospel was preached in all the western world; before the symbol of the Cross every other symbol disappeared, and in the sovereignty of meekness the Galilean reigned. *Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts.*

What the Church most needs to-day is a great apostolic succession of spiritually minded men and women, endued with power from on high, who shall carry forward the blessed world-renewing work of the Holy Spirit. A great apostolic succession, I have said; but need it be so very great? If but a score of the men and women in this church to-night could only catch the apostolic fervour, and set it forth in the works that follow, their influence would speedily tell for Christ on this whole community.

But it should be noticed, there are many ways in which we may be witnesses unto Christ, besides the ways of preaching and teaching, and there is one way which has been effective since the beginning. It is the way of the incarnation, of the Word made flesh, of the Word manifest in the beauty of holiness, in loveliness of perfect deeds. You and I may by God's grace practise that way every day of our life.

Undoubtedly we do need in our community and nation such a faithful confession of Christ before men. There are multitudes among us who are to all appearance untouched by the thought of God and the idea of religion. It is not so much the disintegration of this and that doctrinal belief one deplores, the declension of this and that form and habit of worship; it is the loosening of moral faith itself, the languishing of that moral emotion —be it the fear or love of God—which is the highest preservative of character and the deepest inspiration of conduct. Is it not a great and searching utterance: 'No heart is pure that is not passionate, no virtue is safe that is not enthusiastic'?

It will be said that in these great years through which we have been passing there has been a finding of God anew, whether among those who watched and worked at home, or among those who stood so manfully between us and destruction. And no doubt it has been so in many individual instances. None the less I would say, if we are to purge our national life of the things that weaken, enervate, and demoralize it; if we are to make our national life a true reflex and worthy counterpart of the moral idealism, the gallantry and self-devotion, displayed by our sons and brothers in the grim fighting-line,—then what we should pray and labour for most of all is a great revival, wide and deep, of the knowledge of God in the land, a mighty resistless insurging of the Spirit of God into our hearts in Pentecostal power, and into the hearts of this people.

Here it is that the proper function of our Churches comes clearly to view. It is to bear

witness through Christ to the presence and reality of God in our human life, and so to preserve and increase the knowledge of God in the land. A great and noble work surely. A truly patriotic work. A work that should appeal in particular to generous-minded youth. And it is our work, yours and mine, as we are members of the Church of Christ.

The Church exists for the world's sake. It is the elect of God, but its election is an election to service. By its witness the world is to be saved. And the Church includes within its proper sphere, as has been well and truly said, 'not worship, clergy, doctrine, and charity alone, but the whole troubled world of modern life, its conflicts of classes, its dissensions of industry, its problems of politics, its sins of property.'

Is the Church to be sufficient for these things? Or is it to be content to stand aside as humanity marches by, seeing its own 'insignia,' as some one puts it—of brotherhood, social justice, and the like—displayed on alien banners? Truly these are days of testing for the Church of Christ. And may I at the close of this Convention appeal to you who have named the name of Christ, and are sworn soldiers and servants of the Cross, to you who are here assembled together in that unity of the Spirit which is strength,—may I appeal to you with all the earnestness I know, to keep the flag of true religion flying in this momentous hour, to be living witnesses in this dear land of ours for God and His righteousness, for justice, mercy, and fair brotherhood, for all that is true, pure, lovely, and of good report; so fulfilling your part in lifting the national life into higher strength and stability, into true security;—yet not forgetful ever of the wider obligation resting upon us. For we are consecrated, are we not?, to a world-wide cause. The whole wide world is the field of Christian service.

If humanity is to be saved for any religion at all, saved from materialism, selfishness, and sceptical indifference, in Christianity, and in Christianity alone, lies—as I believe—its one true hope. Only let the Christian Church be faithful to Christ and the sign of His Cross, and in the power of His living Spirit it shall go forth, as in the early days, conquering and to conquer.

Literature.

BOTHA.

Mr. Harold Spender has added a chapter to his biography of *General Botha* (Constable; 10s. 6d. net), and has issued it in a second edition. For now General Botha is dead, and the chapter that has been written is the last.

What a man! What an inspiration and example to all men! What a hero for boys! His life was without the reproach of men. His enemies found nothing but errors in judgment. And history has proved his judgment right. Surely it is one of the most manifest providences that had Botha ready to receive the gift of responsible government when Campbell-Bannerman was called to power in order to give it.

The new chapter is the most marvellous of all. What a task fell to this man, and with what a nobility of mind, also with what a simplicity of faith in God, did he give himself to it and finish it.

THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS.

Professor G. F. Moore of Harvard has at last issued the second volume of his important work on the *History of Religions*. The first volume, covering all except the three great monotheistic religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism, was published in 1913. Seven years is perhaps not too long in which to prepare and produce a volume on these three religions, a volume which by its own excellence will lift its head above the vast quantity of writing on every one of them. Here then is the volume, one of the volumes of the 'International Theological Library,' a volume of five hundred and fifty pages, beautifully printed on excellent paper, and published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark at the surprisingly moderate price of fourteen shillings.

How does Professor Moore understand his task? 'The historian of religion,' he says, 'has to do more than exhibit the facts impartially and in just

proportion, trace the origin and development of ideas and institutions, and define the forces, internal and external, which were operative in this development. He must endeavour to understand and appreciate ways of thinking and feeling remote from his own, and help his readers to a like apprehension. To do this, he must put himself, as far as imagination can go, into the position and attitude of those who formed and entertained these ideas; he must learn to think other men's thoughts after them, as they thought them, and to enter with sympathetic intelligence into their feelings. Accuracy and impartiality without imagination and sympathy can at best give no more than historical materials, not history. How far the present volume realises this ideal others must judge; it has never been absent from the author's mind.'

What a labour it is. What a labour for one of these religions alone. Each has its Scriptures, and the Scriptures must be familiar to their historian. But each has also its innumerable and diverse interpreters of Scripture, and its innumerable and diverse commentators on the interpretations. And that is, after all, only the beginning. But Professor Moore is not satisfied with describing the beginning of Judaism, Christianity, or Mohammedanism. 'A study of the origins of religion can yield nothing but a knowledge of the origins; the religion itself can be known only in its whole history. It is the aim of the present volume, therefore, to exhibit the development of the religions with which it deals as completely as the limits of space permit, passing over no important stage or movement.'

'In the chapters on Christianity the author has not purposed either a sketch of the history of the church or a history of Christian doctrine, but an outline history of the religion itself from the same point of view from which that of other religions is written.' But he has not been able to keep Christian doctrine out of his book. One of its chief merits is the recognition of the indissolubility of religion and theology. But when doctrine appears it appears as doctrine, not as speculation, and so it is at least clearly set forth, whether acceptably or not.

Take the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. 'Paul was a Pharisee; the resurrection of the body was the distinguishing dogma of his school. He had let go pretty nearly all else of his Jewish orthodoxy, but on this point he was tenacious. The resurrection of Christ and the resurrection of believers were in his mind correlative. In Judaism, as in Zoroastrianism, whence the doctrine came, the resurrection was the reintegration out of its dispersed elements of the identical body that was dissolved at death and the reunion of the soul with it, that the whole man, soul and body, might stand at the bar of God's great judgment and receive the just retribution of the deeds which they had together done in the mortal life. The scene of the blessed hereafter beyond resurrection and judgment was this earth, purified and glorified.

'Paul's conception is entirely different. When the Lord comes in the clouds, his saints will be caught up to meet him in the air and go to be for ever with him in heaven. At the same time the dead in Christ will be raised and taken up to heaven. But heaven is no place for flesh and blood, and so those who are living at Christ's coming will be transformed, and the bodies which rise from the tomb will be as unlike those that were committed to it as the plant that springs from the earth is unlike the seed that was buried in it. "It is sown an animal body, it is raised a spiritual body"—that is, probably a body of fiery matter such as angels are made of; it will be like the glorious body of the Lord himself. In another even more significant passage Paul lets go this slender thread of continuity. In a familiar (originally Orphic) metaphor, the body is a tent in which the soul has its transient habitation; when this tent is struck the soul is not left naked and homeless; a celestial body awaits it, an imperishable house of God's own building. Thus for Paul "resurrection" is not the restoration and revivication of the fleshy body, but the assumption to heaven of the soul invested with a new and heavenly body.'

GENERAL BOOTH.

'To thousands of people the man William Booth was only a name, and helped by rumour and slander that name very soon stood for those things that were hateful and noxious in their idea of religion—for quackery, imposture, and cant. To those acquainted with his history, and of course to those who knew him personally, this hatred of the public was both cruel and inexplicable. But the public knew nothing of his early preaching in the

streets of Nottingham, knew nothing of his revival services as a Wesleyan, knew nothing of his long struggle to work loyally with a regular Church; and they knew nothing of his superb honesty, his heroic courage under physical suffering, his noble devotion to his wife and children, his burning sympathy with the poor and depressed. To them the man had sprung up suddenly, without background and without roots; there he was, for the world's coarse thumb and finger—a middle-aged tub-thumper, a brazen-faced charlatan, a pious rogue, a masquerading hypocrite, a cunning scoundrel. What was his object? Money—the object of every man. Why did he dress up in a uniform and order a band to play in front of him? To attract fools—like a clever cheap Jack. What happened in those precious prayer-meetings and holiness meetings? Better not ask; hysterical religion drags the soul into a veritable pit of iniquity.'

Yes, that is how they looked upon him until he was well past middle age. And when he set on foot the great industrial scheme, the attack made upon him, led by Professor Huxley, was more deliberate aad more disgraceful than ever. But when the change of opinion did come it came swiftly. Despised and rejected of men, like the Master he served, he became at the last the chiefest among ten thousand. The King received him, the City of London made him a free citizen, the University of Oxford conferred on him the degree of D.C.L.—you see him in his biography in cap and gown—it was said that the Prime Minister was ready to make him a Peer of the Realm.

But what a history it is! When did you read a more thrilling narrative? When were you allowed to closest intimacy with so rich and varied and human and heavenly a life's experience? Mr. Harold Begbie has written such a *Life of William Booth, the Founder of the Salvation Army* (Macmillan; 2 vols., 42s. net), as will take its place beside the best biographies you possess. For he has given to it the utmost of a great writer's powers, and he had a great subject to work upon.

What was the secret of Booth's success? It was sympathy. With all his masterfulness he might have failed if he had been able to quench the suffering love of his heart. 'During his last visit to America, his daughter Eva persuaded him one afternoon in Chicago to lie down on the sofa, and exacted from him a promise that he would not move till she came to call him with a cup of tea. "Now you won't move, will you, darling?" she pleaded at the door. And the old man said, "No, I won't move; I promise you." But a very short time after leaving him she heard movements in the room. She opened the door and found him walking to and fro, his eyes and cheeks wet with tears. "Darling!" she exclaimed, reproachfully; "you faithfully promised me that you wouldn't move!" "Oh, I know, I know!" he broke out; "but I've been thinking of all the sufferings of little children, the children of the great cities, and I can't rest, I can't rest."' That was the secret of his success. That was the reason why at the last men delighted to do him honour.

The biography is full of the life of the time. Men and women of all ranks appear in its pages 'from the king on the throne to the beggar on the dunghill,' and in the well-chosen words of this skilful biographer, or in the swift sure language of the fiery evangelist himself, we see them as they were. Cecil Rhodes and Lord Loch went out to inspect the Farm Colony at Hadleigh. 'Both were deeply interested, immensely impressed, and no little suprised by what they saw, Mr. Rhodes especially. But General Booth was thinking of other things, and on his way back to London in the railway carriage, he put his hand upon the arm of Cecil Rhodes, and said to him: "I want to speak to you about yourself. You're a man with much depending on you just now. Tell me, how is it with your soul?" Lord Loch looked surprised, but Cecil Rhodes immediately made answer, "Well, General, it's not quite so well with my soul as I could wish." "Do you pray?" inquired the old man. "Sometimes; not quite so often as I should." "Will you let me pray with you—now?" "Yes." Lord Loch turned his face away, and looked out of the window. William Booth and Cecil Rhodes kneeled down together in the railway carriage, and the Salvationist prayed that God would guide, direct, and save the soul of the South African Colossus. When they rose from their knees, Rhodes took the hand of William Booth, and said to him, "I hope you will continue to pray for me."'

MATERIALISM.

Though Haeckel is both dead and discredited, the war with materialism is not yet won. Here

at home, and in the hands of a most accomplished writer, is the old enemy, only with a new face. Mr. Hugh Elliot, in *Modern Science and Materialism* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net), rejects the ancient outward appearance, but the heart is the same. He comes with a sort of double face, one side realism and one idealism, but his realism and his idealism are gathered into one word Monism, and his Monism is just materialism. It is matter, matter everywhere. 'The main purpose of the present work is to defend the doctrine of materialism. It is, indeed, a materialism infinitely different from that of the ancients, for it makes vast concessions to agnosticism, and it concedes the whole foundation of knowledge to idealism. Yet it remains materialism; for I shall endeavour to show that the whole of the positive knowledge available to mankind can be embraced within the limits of a single materialistic system.' That is his own confession.

A little later (p. 143) he expresses himself more fully: it is as emphatic a statement of the materialistic creed as can be made. 'The proposition,' he says, 'which I here desire to advance is that every event occurring in the Universe, including those events known as mental processes, and all kinds of human action or conduct, are expressible purely in terms of matter and motion. If we assume in the primeval nebula of the solar system no other elementary factors beyond those of matter and energy or motion, we can theoretically, as above remarked, deduce the existing Universe, including mind, consciousness, etc., without the introduction of any new factor whatsoever. The existing Universe and all things and events therein may be theoretically expressed in terms of matter and energy, undergoing continuous redistribution in accordance with the ordinary laws of physics and chemistry. If all manifestations within our experience can be thus expressed, as has for long been believed by men of science, what need is there for the introduction of any new entity of spiritual character, called mind?'

Yet Mr. Elliot is an idealist. He gives his last chapter to the proof of it. But 'Idealism, as I have described it, does not deny the existence or the reality of matter. It simply states what matter is, in terms of consciousness. It defines a portion of matter as a nucleus of associated sensations.' His idealism is his own.

ERASMUS AND LUTHER.

The force of the old cynic's words that 'of making many books there is no end' is felt, not when we pass through a library, even a large one, but when we look at a list of the books which have been written on one limited subject, say such a subject as the ideas of Erasmus and Luther on Toleration. The Rev. Robert H. Murray, Litt.D., Blake Scholar in History, Trinity College, Dublin, has studied that subject and written a book on it—*Erasmus and Luther: Their Attitude to Toleration* (S.P.C.K.; 25s. net), and at the end of the book he gives a bibliography. It occupies a little over 27 pages, and must contain nearly 800 entries.

Perhaps Dr. Murray will not allow that it is a limited subject. Certainly he finds material in it for a very large book, and that without making it an excuse for the introduction of his opinion on everything in heaven and earth, without actually ever wandering into one irrelevant excursus. We think he might have condensed his matter occasionally, comprehending many particulars in one general statement. But we freely admit that a man who has studied a subject so thoroughly as he has studied the writings of Luther and Erasmus on Toleration should be allowed space to set forth the facts fully, and even to discuss inconsistencies. Done in this way it is done once for all.

We admit more than that. We admit that Toleration is a living enough subject to be inseparable from other subjects. The discussion of the views of Erasmus and Luther on Toleration raises the problem of Authority. To that problem Dr. Murray devotes a whole long chapter, and it is neither out of place nor too long. In that chapter we find some of the fundamental things. We find Luther's attitude to the Bible. For his attitude to the Bible came out of his attitude to Authority. 'What Luther requires is certainty. He does not fear that his doctrine is not true, for he knows that his theology "comes from heaven." Rejecting the authority of the Church, not believing, as St. Anselm did, in the power of intellect, he finds truth in the Bible and in the Bible alone. The Word of God is the supreme reason which dominates all reasons, the proof which supersedes all proofs. Certainty of faith is not in the continuity of tradition, in that long chain which unites the Church of the sixteenth

century with that of the Apostolic age, St. Thomas Aquinas to Bede, Bede to the Fathers, the Fathers to the Apostles. It rests completely in the unique testimony of the Scripture taken "in its simplest meaning." Luther receives truths and definitions: he receives the truths because they are evangelical, and the definitions because they have texts to support them. The outcome was the removal from dogma of all the ideas grafted on to it. They may be true, they may be probable, but if they cannot find scriptural proof they have no binding value on the Christian. Of course he was compelled to sweep away all interpretations save the literal, and this forms one of his greatest merits. It is in the name of scriptural literalism that he preserved the dogma of the real presence and pronounced against the religious radicalism of Carlstadt. Clearness is a prime quality of the record of revelation. Outwardly little has altered, whereas inwardly everything has altered. The adherence to the Bible finishes the work begun by the principle of justification by faith.'

Again: 'Luther's criterion of the sacred record was, he thought, plain. "The right text," he laid down, "by which to judge its books is whether they preach Christ. Whatever does not preach Christ is not apostolic, even though it had been written by St. Peter or St. Paul. And, on the other hand, whatever does preach Christ would be apostolic even though it proceeded from Judas, Pilate or Herod. But this James only preaches the law and obedience to the law, and mixes the one with the other in a confusing fashion. Therefore I will not admit him in my Bible among the number of true canonical writers. But at the same time I will forbid none to place and esteem him as they please." The last sentence indicates the broad-mindedness of the writer. The whole passage indicates that his condemnation of St. James's Epistle is comparative, not absolute. Nevertheless, while Luther was unaware of it his criticism undermined the infallibility of the book which meant so much to him, assigning him a place among the beginners of doctrinal critics, though not, of course, among textual critics. He is an ancestor of F. C. Baur: he is not an ancestor of Richard Simon. He anticipates modern criticism. His anticipation, however, proceeds not from the tests of the higher critic but from his faith in Christ. Had Ritschl taught his value-judgments in 1522, the great revolutionary would have appreciated them. As he reads the Epistle to the Hebrews he is convinced that neither St. Paul nor any other Apostle wrote it.'

And again: 'Johannine thought appealed far more strongly to Erasmus than to Luther. The latter is plainly puzzled by the Revelation of St. John the Divine. Still he writes, "As to this book I allow each man to form his own opinion, and will not bind down any one to my own judgment or my own ignorance, I say what I feel." The modern way in which he looked at the Bible, especially the Old Testament, continually astonishes one. To him it matters little if Moses himself did not write the five books which bear his name. It may well be, he thought, that Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Hosea contain additions, and have reached their present forms from later writers. He has the insight to see that the book of Job is not a history, but a poem or drama.'

Those quotations give a fair idea of the leisurely carry-it-all-with-you style of our author. To read his book one must have a little time to spare. But then——

SURVIVAL.

The most comprehensive book on Spiritualism which we have seen is *Man's Survival after Death.* Messrs. Grant Richards have published a new and enlarged edition (10s. 6d. net). The author is a Vicar of the Church of England, the Rev. Charles L. Tweedale. It runs to nearly six hundred closely printed pages—far too much reading for the ordinary man. But the very purpose of the author is to bring evidence enough for all the parts and practices of spiritualism to compel his readers to believe in it.

Many of his cases are already well advertised and well known. They are none the worse for that; if they are true. The question is, How far can Mr. Tweedale himself be relied on? When he produces new cases, especially when he produces examples of spiritualistic phenomena out of his own experience, can we trust his judgment, can we respect his carefulness and restraint? There is an excellent test. He has offered it himself.

It is the way he speaks of the Holy Spirit. He need not have spoken of the Holy Spirit at all. He introduces the subject in a footnote. And what he says is that there is no Holy Spirit. He

says it with the clearest and coolest confidence. 'The "Holy Ghost" is not another spirit personality of the Godhead, but a term used to indicate those manifestations of good or holy spiritual influence, or power, exercised by God, the Great Spirit, through various intermediary spirit personalities.' And then at the end of the note he adds: 'The scheme of spiritual being and manifestation shown us in the Old and New Testaments is (1) God (the Spirit of God), who is the Father, the Creator, the Lord and Giver of life; (2) Christ; (3) the archangels; (4) the angels; (5) human angels, the arisen spirits of the departed. The "Holy Ghost" is the good or holy spiritual influence and power of (1) exercised through (2), (3), (4) and (5).' The man who can say that, and say it so confidently, is not the man to persuade one to believe in spirit-rapping or table-turning.

His case rests upon the idea of a spiritual body. He knows all about it. He knows that it is material, but the matter of it so very attenuated sometimes as to be almost invisible, like steam as it issues from the spout of a kettle. He knows that sometimes it is more material, and is then visible to any eye, like the same steam after it has left the kettle some distance. He knows that sometimes it becomes still more material and can be photographed. And all the time he knows just as much about it as the rest of us.

But the cumulative evidence? Yes, it is impressive—just as a great heap of loose grains of sand is impressive. But the greater the heap the less wisdom in building your house upon it.

ARTHUR HUGH CLOUGH.

Clough died on the thirteenth day of November 1861, and the interest in his personality is as keen to-day as on that day. He is like Newman in this respect, most unlike him as he was in other respects, even antagonistic. For one of the best ways in which Mr. James Insley Osborne characterizes Clough is by opposing him to Newman: 'Newman has celebrated the phrase that represented to him the intuition on which he came to base all truth and conduct: "Securus judicat orbis terrarum." Clough was not imaginative like Newman. The strong force in him was his individual conscience. It was in his conscience therefore that he found his test of truth. A motto for him in form parallel to Newman's would require for *orbis terrarum* some such words as *conscientia individua fortis*.'

Mr. Osborne has written another biography of *Arthur Hugh Clough* (Constable; 8s. 6d. net)—such a biography as can be written now when Clough and all his contemporaries are far enough away to be seen in their proper dimension. One grand mistake was made by Clough—he had no youth. Unlike that famous person who would not grow up, he grew up too soon. He went to Rugby just when Arnold began his experiment there of ruling by passing all rule into the hands of the senior lads. Clough took up the responsibility as no other did—not even Stanley. It is probable that he and not Stanley was the original of Tom Brown's Arthur. The consequence was a seriousness which made boyhood impossible. Then came the retribution. His boyhood asserted its rights in manhood. He never lost the sense of vocation, but it was to something quite other now than outward behaviour and rigid righteousness. He is called a poet of doubt. That is wrong. He was not even interested (as Newman was) in theories of religion. His whole life was spent in thoughts and purposes about right living.

> O Thou, in that mysterious shrine
> Enthroned, as I must say, divine!
> I will not frame one thought of what
> Thou mayest either be or not.
> I will not prate of 'thus' and 'so,'
> And be profane with 'yes' and 'no,'
> Enough that in our soul and heart
> Thou, whatsoe'er Thou mayest be, art.

The interest of the book—a keen interest it is—lies in the study of Clough the man, but the poetry is also studied and criticised, even minutely.

DEMOCRACY.

Democracy is still the most popular word in the United States of America. And before it loses its charm two enterprising scholars—Frederick A. Cleveland and Joseph Schafer—have edited and issued a great volume of five hundred pages, to tell us what an excellent thing democracy is, and how much of the great task of reconstructing the world may safely be laid upon it. The whole subject is divided into many parts, and each part is assigned to a specialist. The title is *Democracy in Reconstruction* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company; London: Constable; 12s. 6d. net).

The writers believe in President Wilson. Whether that implies a particular political banner cannot be said. They believe in the President and they believe in his ideals. These ideals (it has been already pointed out in this magazine) are three: Justice, Liberty, and Equality. They are not a complete list of ideals for any president or for any country, but they are good so far as they go. Are they fulfilled?

The difficulty is with Equality. For Justice and Liberty you can now make out a fair case in any civilized nation. But are not the inequalities in every nation still glaring and disconcerting—in Britain with its social cliques and castes, in America with its race riots? And between nation and nation? To introduce the word is to be laughed at. We are told that there are three forms of government in modern states—the autocratic (Prussia), the aristocratic (Great Britain), and the democratic (the United States). It is the last that claims the ideals, of Justice, Liberty, and Equality, and their fulfilment. If therefore these three are the ideals of democracy, the exposition of democracy which occupies this large volume ought to show us these ideals of life in actual exercise or at least approaching it. The writers recognize the demand as reasonable. But they also recognize the long way that democracy has yet to go. It is only as a great hope for the future that the reconstructive power of democracy is offered to us. As long as such terrible things can be said about women and children as one woman writer says here, it is painfully evident that neither Justice, Liberty, nor Equality is an ideal that is greatly realized yet.

Still, it is much that they are held forth as ideals—held forth and urged insistently—by some of the writers even pleadingly—in this book. It has not been written in vain.

LADY GEORGIANA PEEL.

Lady Georgiana Peel was one of the daughters of Lord John Russell. Her autobiography has been edited by her daughter, Ethel Peel. The title is *Recollections of Lady Georgiana Peel* (John Lane; 16s. net).

The first person is used throughout. The editor does not once let herself be seen, though it is very likely that she had much to do with the make-up and management of the material. One amusing slip she must get the credit for. You turn up 'Lady Georgiana Peel' in the index to recall the events of her life, and find: 'Peel, Lady Georgiana. See "I" (Lady Georgiana Russell), "Gee."' You turn to 'I' and find: 'See Lady Georgiana Russell; Lady Georgiana Peel.' You turn finally to Lady Georgiana Russell and find that there is no such entry. So her father Lord John Russell is fully described in the index, also her husband, Mr. Archibald Peel (under 'A'), but the Lady herself is clean passed over.

Very well—read the book. It is better than an index. For it is most readable. All the political great ones of those early days of Queen Victoria are in it, and always there is just that touch of intimacy or sympathy which gives them life. Mr. Stuart Reid's biography of Lord John Russell in the 'Prime Ministers' series is a great book, but it is dull and dead beside this effervescing narrative.

One unexpected effect of reading it is to increase our good opinion of Queen Victoria—her ability and, still more, her humour—her whole power and personality indeed. There is no effort at recalling good stories, yet there are good stories. This is one. It is of Balmoral and the Crathie Church. 'An amusing little incident that has somehow stuck in my memory is of Colonel Grey handing round the collecting box—which was like a long ladle—during the service. As was the custom, he had been all round to every one in the kirk first, and came into the Queen's pew last. I suppose he must have been nervous, or he stumbled, for down went the box on the floor with a tremendous rattle, all the shillings and sixpences and pennies rolling noisily about everywhere. This was too much for the Queen, also the sight of Colonel Grey's worried and apologetic countenance. She went into fits of laughter, shaking with mirth. Bessie and I, who were in the next pew, hurried to Colonel Grey's aid, and went down on our knees, searching for money, but we were also nearly helpless with laughter, and crawled on the floor much longer than we need have done, so that no one should see our faces. I don't think the little Princes and Princesses were present on that Sunday.'

PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN CREEDS.

Mr. Edward Carpenter does not, any more than Viscount Morley, give the Rationalist Press

Association much direct assistance, but he is unmistakably rationalistic. He has the same short vision, the same impatience with accurate scholarship, the same determination to discredit Christianity, as Mr. John M. Robertson or any other active member of the Association. And in his new book *Pagan and Christian Creeds* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net) he takes the very same method to accomplish his determined end. That the method has been discredited by scholars, even by scholars of his own way of thinking, like Dr. Conybeare, is of no consequence. He sails along in his easy, excellent English style and ignores all such inconveniences. The pagan mysteries explain everything in Christianity—everything that is left to explain.

There is not much left. For the Gospel story is not true. You will hear how he proves that. 'Certainly,' he says, 'the difficulties in the way of regarding the Gospel story (or stories, for there is not one consistent story) as *true* are enormous. If anyone will read, for instance, in the four Gospels, the events of the night preceding the crucifixion and reckon the time which they would necessarily have taken to enact—the Last Supper, the agony in the Garden, the betrayal by Judas, the haling before Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin, and then before Pilate in the Hall of Judgment (though courts for the trial of malefactors do not *generally* sit in the middle of the night); then—in Luke—the interposed visit to Herod, and the *return* to Pilate; Pilate's speeches and washing of hands before the crowd; then the scourging and the mocking and the arraying of Jesus in purple robe as a king; then the preparation of a Cross and the long and painful journey to Golgotha; and finally the Crucifixion at sunrise;—he will see—as has often been pointed out—that the whole story is physically impossible. As a record of actual events the story is impossible; but as a record or series of notes derived from the witnessing of a "mystery-play"—and such plays with *very similar* incidents were common enough in antiquity in connexion with cults of a dying Saviour, it very likely *is* true (one can see the very dramatic character of the incidents: the washing of hands, the threefold denial by Peter, the purple robe and crown of thorns, and so forth); and as such it is now accepted by many well-qualified authorities.'

Who are the authorities? Mr. Carpenter in a footnote refers only to Frazer's *Golden Bough*. He needs all the authority that Frazer carries, for his own knowledge of the subject is limited enough. The very next paragraph begins in this way: 'There are many other difficulties. The raising of Lazarus, already dead three days, the turning of water into wine (a miracle attributed to Bacchus, of old), the feeding of the five thousand, and others of the marvels are, to say the least, not easy of digestion.' Already dead three days—it is most unexpected modesty. Then comes this sentence—very nearly incredible at the present day: 'The "Sermon on the Mount" which, with the "Lord's Prayer" embedded in it, forms the great and accepted repository of "Christian" teaching and piety, is well known to be a collection of sayings from pre-christian writings, including the Psalms, Isaiah, Ecclesiasticus, the *Secrets of Enoch*, the *Shemonehesreh* (a book of Hebrew prayers), and others; and the fact that this collection was really made *after* the time of Jesus, and could not have originated from Him, is clear from the stress which it lays on "persecutions" and "false prophets"—things which were certainly not a source of trouble at the time Jesus is supposed to be speaking, though they were at a later time—as well as from the occurrence of the word "Gentiles," which being here used apparently in contradistinction to "Christians" could not well be appropriate at a time when no recognized Christian bodies as yet existed.'

At any rate he believes in the existence of Jesus? Yes, for the moment. But a few pages after he hesitates about it, and a few pages more he doubts it, 'there is no *certainty* at all that he ever existed.'

A MILLIONAIRE DEMOCRAT.

If you have not heard of Joseph Fels, you have heard of Fels-naphtha. Joseph Fels was a little Jew (five foot two was it not?) who entered on his father's business of making and selling scented soap, and then found a firm in that line of things which had an invention and could make nothing of it. He bought the patent, called it Fels-naphtha, and in spite of himself became a millionaire.

Yes, in spite of himself. For not only did he give and give, but he apologized for being a millionaire, and did everything (except sell out)

to keep down the profits. In any case he lived as near to the struggling worker and wage-earner as a millionaire can live, and spent his money, not in charity (which is so easily puffed up), but in plans and purposes for the uplifting of the poor man's lot in life.

His great scheme was the Single Tax. Use capitals. He read Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*, and was converted. He spared neither his money nor himself in advocating the Single Tax. He advocated it both in Britain and in America. There is a fine account, written by Margaret Macmillan of his appearance before a critical Oxford audience, and his complete capture of their hearts and heads.

He did not spare himself and he did not spare other millionaires. Only a millionaire could write or receive such a letter as Joseph Fels wrote and Mr. Carnegie received one day at Skibo. 'I do not doubt that, during the money panic in New York, you could have made an extra $50,000,000, but I can hardly be asked to respect your reason for not making it! Somebody else probably made it, and did his share towards further choking the freedom of the people!' There is no record of reply.

The title is *Joseph Fels: His Life-work*, by Mary Fels (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net).

THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

We can no longer complain that the doctrine of the Atonement is neglected. Only a few months ago we had the Bampton Lectures of Dr. Hastings Rashdall, with a history of Christian thought on the subject and a very unsatisfactory statement of belief by the lecturer himself. Now we have *A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement*, by the Rev. L. W. Grensted, M.A., B.D., Principal of Egerton Hall, Manchester, issued from the Manchester University Press, and published in London by Messrs. Longmans (9s. 6d. net).

Both books are histories of the doctrine. That is the safe way with this particular doctrine, and it can become a very interesting and suggestive way. For the history of the doctrine of the Atonement is a history, one might say, of Christian doctrine, it is certainly a history of the doctrine of God; and then it introduces us to men who are honourable and great—Abelard, Anselm, Aquinas, Athanasius, Augustine, Bernard, Bonaventura, Bushnell, Calvin, Campbell, Dale, Denney, and many more.

Dr. Rashdall was very good reading. Mr. Grensted is more condensed and quotes much more fully. But Mr. Grensted may be read as enjoyably as Dr. Rashdall, and he will repay the greater demand he makes on eyesight or attention. His knowledge of his subject is astonishingly minute and astonishingly accurate. His judgment, too, when he exercises it, is quite sufficiently reliable; for he is as free from prepossession as a man can be who has worked so long and so studiously on a great and greatly controverted subject. He gives Moberly a higher award than we think he deserves. But that is easily understood and forgiven.

In what direction are we to look for more light on the doctrine? The concluding paragraph tells us: 'It is only in recent years that interest has been taken in the philosophy of mysticism, and its connexion with the problem of personality has been seen. The investigation of this latter problem is one of the most important and most urgent tasks of to-day. To speak of God as Ruler, Judge, or even as Father, is but to use a partial and necessarily one-sided metaphor. But when we speak of Him as Personal we use a term within which is contained all the meaning which our human personality but faintly shadows forth. In the word "person" is contained that which we need to a true doctrine of Atonement. No theory can stand which makes God less than personal, in the fullest sense in which man can understand the term, and it is the attempt to apply to the Atonement this highest concept of which man is capable which makes Moberly's work so valuable. In the detail of his theory there may be much to modify. His critics, at any rate, have been many. Yet few recent writings are at once so sane and so constructive, and, despite much misunderstanding, it is in such attempts that the hope of the future lies.'

ST. PAUL.

Dr. A. H. McNeile's *St. Paul: His Life, Letters, and Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 10s. net), issued so soon after Professor David Smith's book, will run it hard. It is only half the size and half the price, the difference in both respects being due to one

circumstance—Dr. McNeile has not thought it necessary to include in his volume a complete translation of the Pauline Epistles: he has decided that a survey and synopsis of them is enough.

Dr. McNeile, though now Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin, is a Cambridge scholar. He is indeed still a Fellow of Sidney Sussex College in Cambridge. That means the utmost sense of responsibility for every statement made and every accent put upon a Greek word. If we are not startled by strange judgments of men or events, we are not distracted by doubts of their reliability. And yet Dr. McNeile is original. That is to say, every judgment, sober and sensible as it is, is his own judgment, obtained by his own unwearied study and expressed in his own unmistakable language.

Notice some points. On the difficult question regarding the authorship of the 'We' sections of Acts, Dr. McNeile writes: 'The facts can best be accounted for by supposing that the original notes, mostly quite brief records of St. Paul's movements, but with an occasional anecdote added, were the work of St. Luke, and that many years later he made them the basis of the narrative in its present form.'

The visit to Jerusalem of Gal 2^{1-10} is identified with the famine visit of Ac 11^{27-30}; it therefore preceded the first missionary journey, whereas the Apostolic Council was held after that journey. This is almost a settled question now. But we shall see what Professor Lake's great book has to say of it.

Ephesians is probably St. Paul's. But 'it is not a matter on which we can be entirely confident. The epistle *may* be Pauline but not by St. Paul; but it is doubtful if the reasons adduced are strong enough to force us to abandon the traditional view that it contains the sublime outpouring of the maturest thoughts of the apostle of the Gentiles.'

The Pastoral Epistles are probably not his. 'The three epistles as wholes have probably been built up as general treatises for the guidance of the Church by some devoted disciple of his, who has breathed in his spirit and teaches his Gospel.'

Messrs. Cecil Palmer & Hayward have reissued Mr. Horace Leaf's *What is this Spiritualism?* at 3s. 6d. net. It is a sort of official exposition of the subject, for Mr. Leaf is the Hon. Secretary of the Spiritualist Education Council. But those who seek to it for light or leading will be disappointed. Perhaps Mr. Leaf thinks that we know quite well what spiritualism is, or perhaps he has no clear idea himself; in any case he simply repeats things that have been often said already (and said quite falsely), that the Christian Church has no certain teaching to give regarding the life to come, and then passes to the narration of wonderful deeds done in the dark here and there, which he claims to be the doing of 'discarnate spirits.' There is, of course, much display of the names of Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir Conan Doyle. Let us commend to Mr. Leaf some weighty words spoken by Dr. G. M. Robertson, Physician-Superintendent of the Royal Mental Hospital, Edinburgh, at the annual meeting of that institution on the 23rd day of February 1920:

'Since Dr. Charles Mercier quoted in the preface of his book on "Spiritualism and Sir Oliver Lodge," my warning on the danger of neurotic persons engaging in practical inquiries of a spiritualistic nature, I have received many requests to say more on the subject. I have little to add, save to reaffirm the statements then made. I do not consider either Sir Conan Doyle or Sir Oliver Lodge to be safe judges, whose opinion should be accepted in this difficult and important subject, in view of their bereavements and unconscious desires. If the wish be father to the thought, it is mother to the hallucination of the sense. The tricks the brain can play without calling in spiritualistic aid are simply astounding, and only those who have made a study of morbid as well as normal psychology realise the full truth of this.'

A short and authoritative statement of what *The Eucharistic Sacrifice* means to those who adore it will be found in a book with that title published by Mr. Robert Scott. It is one of the Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice (3s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. Darwell Stone, D.D., Principal of Pusey House, Oxford.

The Bishop of Salisbury writes a Foreword to *The Life of Saint Osmund*, by the Rev. W. J. Torrance, M.A. (Skeffingtons; 3s. 6d. net). He says: 'It is part of the humiliation of one who stands ninety-fourth amongst the Bishops of the

Diocese where his name will be for ever honoured, and owes his position as Precentor of the Southern Province to S. Osmund, that he has the audacity to sit where that great Saint ruled, and the great privilege to be permitted to remember before the altar one who shone as a light in his generation, and who surely adds a petition for the Diocese he loved to the prayers of the Saints.' The book is written with ability, sympathy, and knowledge.

Nine sermons for the Sundays and Festivals *From Ash Wednesday to Easter Day* have been published by Messrs. Skeffington (4s. net). The preacher is the Venerable John Wakeford, B.D., Precentor of Lincoln. They are sermons worth the cost of publishing even in these days in which the publishing of sermons is so nearly impossible. One in particular strikes the note of truth and simplicity with effect. It is a practical sermon on the Freedom of the Will for the First Sunday in Lent.

The Rev. J. A. Craigie, M.A., is much distressed on account of 'our unhappy divisions.' 'I do not believe,' he says, 'that the sadly-divided state of Christian people is realized sufficiently. I make no apology whatever for turning the tap on, as it were, for starting the list for you to-day, and you can find out and finish it at your leisure. Very grave are our divisions: The Independents, the Baptists, the Particular Baptists, the Calvinistic Baptists, the Congregational Baptists, the Old Baptists, the Open Baptists, the Strict Baptists, the Union Baptists. The Methodists, the Refuge Methodists, the Primitive Methodists, the Benevolent Methodists, the Free Methodists, the Unitarians and Inghamites and Sandemanians, and Mormons, and Bible Christians and Morisonians and Glassites and Cameronians and the whole rigmarole.' Yes, it is very distressing. Decent men find 'the whole rigmarole' so unnecessary. For 'when a Sandemanian competes with a Glassite, or a Morisonian with a Particular Baptist, the result is likely to be the creation of a very decided and nasty party-spirit.' But as a Sandemanian *is* a Glasite (John Glas spelt his name with one *s*) it is difficult to see how the one could compete with the other. Mr. Craigie is happier in his application of *The Seven Parables of the Church* (Skeffingtons; 2s. 6d. net) to his own and our individual iniquities.

To the S.P.C.K. 'Biblical Studies,' Professor W. E. Barnes contributes a pamphlet on *The Testimony of Josephus to Jesus Christ* (4d. net). He believes the passage in Josephus to be genuine. Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson writes on *Christ's Perpetual Intercession* (4d. net). The S.P.C.K. has issued the Archbishop of Canterbury's Report on *The Ministry of Women* (6d. net), and the Report on *The Church and Social Service* (1s. net).

Professor Alexander Souter, D.Litt., has edited for the S.P.C.K. Latin Texts a translation of *Tertullian against Praxeas* (5s. net). In the Introduction he tells us all we need at present to know about Tertullian himself, about Praxeas, and about the treatise *Adversus Praxean.* Praxeas 'insisted on divine unity to such a degree that he destroyed the Trinity. Crudely expressed, his position was that the Father alone was God, and that all the experiences undergone by Jesus in His earthly life were undergone by the Father. The other two Persons in the Trinity were reduced to mere modality. Praxeas later recanted, but his heresy was to spring up later with Sabellius, from whose name it comes to be called Sabellianism.' The translation is, of course, the last word in insight and accuracy.

The Rev. H. L. Goudge has published *Three Lectures on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, which he delivered to the clergy of the Diocese of Wakefield (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). Dr. Goudge's work is always original, and even on the Epistle to the Ephesians he is able to be himself and no other. In the first chapter he follows the steps of the writer of the Epistle (St. Paul, he believes) along the way of mental and spiritual experience which God led him till he wrote it. The second lecture has the Atonement at the heart of it—and the Atonement through identification. The central thought of the third lecture is 'the Heavenlies.' Here is an exegetical sentence—the text is 'Put on the whole armour of God': 'I hope that Dr. Robinson has convinced you that by the armour of God St. Paul means the armour which God wears, and that our people will hear less than in the past about the prætorian guardsmen in charge of St. Paul at Rome or the Syrian legionaries of Cæsarea.'

Sceptics will scoff at the idea of going to the

Ten Plagues of Egypt for lessons in hygiene. But Dr. Percival Wood, Capt. R.A.M.C., does it and with unmistakable benefit. He experienced some of the plagues while he was campaigning in Mesopotamia. Was there one of them that he did not experience? And he had little difficulty in believing in their reality. He studied the record. He proceeded to study the Laws of Moses in detail. Then he wrote a book on *Moses, the Founder of Preventive Medicine* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net). It is as modern and scientific a book as you can desire, and yet it gives Moses the credit for far-seeing and sound principles of medical legislation.

Mr. Edward Grubb, M.A., has published some Notes on the Johannine Gospel and Epistle under the title of *The Word made Flesh* (S.C.M.; 4s. and 2s. 6d.). The Notes are critical, exegetical, expository, and devotional. For Mr. Grubb (a scholarly Quaker) has and exercises all these gifts.

At the Swarthmore Press is published *The Society of Friends: Its Faith and Practice*, by John S. Rowntree. The fifth edition, revised and enlarged, has been issued (1s. 6d. net).

Not Jewish teachers only, but earnest and honest teachers everywhere, will benefit by the study of Rabbi Louis Grossmann's book on *The Aims of Teaching in Jewish Schools* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College). Dr. Grossmann is himself enthusiastic and as thorough as he is enthusiastic. No plot of ground is left uncultivated. No doubt there are ideals and aspirations in the book which do not rise to the highest height. 'His [the Jewish child's] participation in public worship is his expression that he shares in the loyalties and aspirations which Jews have in common. It is also an exercise and discipline; the main aim of synagogue worship is educational and pedagogical. Jewish adults, as well as children, attend services and take part in the ritual, not because their religious status is incomplete without such services, but because the influence of the synagogue is designed to train their religious life.'

Messrs. Edward Arnold have issued a third edition of *The Land of Goshen and the Exodus*, by Sir Hanbury Brown, K.C.M.G. (7s. 6d. net). The book was reviewed by Professor Sayce in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES when it first appeared. And it was reviewed favourably. For then Professor Sayce and Sir Hanbury Brown agreed on the place where the Israelites crossed the Red Sea. They agree no longer—unless Professor Sayce also has changed his mind and we have not observed it. Sir Hanbury Brown now believes that the Yam Sûph is just the Red Sea of the English version and that 'both terms alike denote the modern Red Sea together with its gulfs of Suez and Akaba.'

The Jews' Who's Who (Beamish; 21s.) is by no means so bulky a book as the *Who's Who* we are familiar with, but it is much more than a *Who's Who*. It is a remarkable book in many ways. Not only does it contain much information which one would not think of looking for in a Who's Who, but it expresses opinions that are just as unexpected.

The first page is the title-page. The second page (we have not far to go) gives an account of the Kaiser Jubilee Fund of 1913. The names of the members of the Committee are given and the sums they contributed. Then we read: 'It is interesting to note that the chief supporters of this fund are: (1) *all* British subjects, either by naturalization or birth; (2) had *all* accumulated their wealth out of the British Empire and the British people; (3) that the bulk of them hold British orders of chivalry; (4) that nearly all of them are JEWS.' The last word is printed in large capitals.

By this time we have discovered that *The Jews' Who's Who*, issued by the Judaic Publishing Company, is not such a Who's Who as the Jews themselves would issue. It is clear that 'an enemy hath done this.'

A series of volumes on Social Service is to be issued 'under the ægis of the Ratan Tata Department of Social Science and Administration in the University of London.' The publishers will be Messrs. Bell & Sons. Mr. C. R. Attlee, M.A., will be the general editor. He has himself written the first volume. It is a survey of the ground to be covered by the series, and goes by the title of *The Social Worker* (6s. net). Mr. Attlee is anxious to have it understood that the words 'social service' or 'social work' will be used in a larger, better sense than they usually carry. 'The every-day meaning of social worker suggests someone

from a superior social class who, through some religious or charitable motive, endeavours to assist the poor, but in this series it is given a wider meaning so as to include all those whose work is directly social in its motive and effects.' Accordingly, 'the series of books of which this is the introductory volume is an attempt to show what has been done in the past and what is being done now in various fields of social work, to discuss some of the problems that affect different groups of people at certain ages or in certain capacities, and to describe the methods of solution that are being adopted. It is in fact an endeavour to answer the question asked by many people, "What can I do to perform my duty as a citizen?"'

In his Pocket Edition of the 'World's Classics,' Mr. Humphrey Milford of the Oxford University Press has published a facsimile of the copy of Thomas à Kempis' *Of the Imitation of Christ* used and marked by Edith Cavell during her imprisonment (2s. 6d. net). The sentences which came home to her most helpfully are marked by a line in the margin. This sentence is marked by four lines: 'So shalt thou keep one and the same countenance, always with thanksgiving, both in prosperity and adversity, weighing all things with an equal balance.'

Under the title of *Jesus as they saw Him*, the Rev. J. Alexander Findlay, M.A., is publishing studies of the Synoptic Gospels for the special use and advantage of teachers. Part II. deals with the Gospel according to Luke (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net).

'Seeing that so many chaplains have taken in hand to set down their thoughts on the situation, it seems almost necessary that Wesleyan chaplains also who have had long and intimate experience of religious work in Navy and Army should make their contribution to the discussion.' So says the Rev. F. L. Wiseman, B.A., editing and introducing a volume of Essays chiefly by Wesleyan Methodist ex-Chaplains entitled *The Christ of the Soldier* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). The writers, we are told (there are nine of them), 'have enjoyed exceptional opportunities of studying the problem at first hand. Some have served as chaplains in the Army for many years before the war; some, before receiving commissions as chaplains, served in the ranks; one approaches the subject from the layman's standpoint.' We quote one significant paragraph. The writer is the Rev. W. Rushby, M.C.:

'The attendance of men at the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was some indication of their attitude to Christ. The number of Nonconformists was remarkable; frequently fifty per cent. of those present at the parade service remained for Holy Communion. It astonished our Church of England friends that very often, where they had sixty-five per cent. in the brigade to our twenty-five per cent, though they urged Holy Communion, while we only invited to it, our communicants equalled or outnumbered theirs. Had we given Holy Communion more prominence, we should have secured more; had the Anglicans given it a less central place, they also would have drawn more. We need to learn from each other.'

Mr. Stephen Leacock is a writer of humorous essays. He is also a writer of essays without humour. And the latter are better than the former. His latest book is in the best line. Its title, *The Unsolved Riddle of Social Justice* (Lane; 5s. net), has no humour in it, only grim earnestness; and as the title so the book. Turn, if you are in a hurry — but for our part we have read the book throughout, and have had to stop and think — if you are in a hurry turn to the chapter in which he speaks about the children. 'It should be recognized in the coming order of society, that every child of the nation has the right to be clothed and fed and trained irrespective of its parents' lot. Our feeble beginnings in the direction of housing, sanitation, child welfare and education, should be expanded at whatever cost into something truly national and all-embracing. The ancient grudging selfishness that would not feed other people's children should be cast out. In war time the wealthy bachelor and the spinster of advancing years took it for granted that other people's children should fight for them. The obligation must apply both ways.'

Here is plain speaking. Take a little more. 'No society is properly organized until every child that is born into it shall have an opportunity in life. Success in life and capacity to live we cannot give. But opportunity we can. We can at least see that the gifts that are laid in the child's cradle by nature are not obliterated by the cruel fortune

of the accident of birth: that its brain and body are not stunted by lack of food and air and by the heavy burden of premature toil. The playtime of childhood should be held sacred by the nation.'

The Menace of Spiritualism, by Elliot O'Donnell (Werner Laurie; 5s. net), is written by a Roman Catholic, and has a Foreword from Father Bernard Vaughan. The Foreword ends thus: 'My advice to all readers of this spirited exposure of Spiritualism is to shun it as they would cocaine. In neither drug is to be discovered the Will of God, which is man's end in life, but in both may be found ruin of body and loss of soul. This very morning I heard of a girl, who, being told in a séance by her deceased lover that he would not live on the other side without her, drowned herself to join him, not, I fancy, in heaven—"Notum fac mihi, Domine, finem meum."'

The chief purpose of Mr. O'Donnell's book is to refute the claim of the spiritualist that he is in harmony with the teaching of Scripture. Some striking testimonies are quoted from medical men to the danger of dabbling in Spiritualism to one who has the least tendency to neurosis.

Dr. Rendel Harris has been away in search of the subsequent fortunes of that ship which carried the Pilgrim Fathers in 1620 from the Old England to the New. The difficulty is due to the fact that *Mayflower* was quite a favourite name for a ship in those days. Dr. Rendel Harris is undaunted. And his story of *The Last of the 'Mayflower,'* published at the Manchester University Press (Longmans; 5s. net), is quite as entrancing as a boys' book of adventure.

Canon J. Gurnhill's book on *The Spiritual Philosophy* required amplification. He has amplified it in another book which he calls *Interpretation of the Spiritual Philosophy* (Longmans; 8s. 6d. net) 'My object,' he says, 'in this present volume has been to trace the gradual growth and development of the spiritual and religious concept of God, and His purpose concerning mankind. I believe that this concept, both in its origin and development, has been due to the immanent Spirit of God working by the method and process of evolution first in Nature, secondly by more direct spiritual agencies, but lastly and chiefly through the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, and all that it implies.'

Messrs. Longmans have published a book long looked for but not known to be even on the way—a scholarly up-to-date edition of Pascal's Provincial Letters in the French. The editor of this edition of *Les Lettres Provinciales de Blaise Pascal* (8s. 6d. net) is the Rev. H. F. Stewart, D.D., Fellow and Prælector in French Studies, Trinity College, Cambridge.

The volume belongs to the French series of the Manchester University Modern Language Texts, and has all the excellences of that excellent series, with the additional excellence that it is a work by Pascal. The text is printed with Cambridge accuracy: the introduction discusses all the problems; the notes elucidate all the difficulties that can be elucidated; the bibliography names all, or nearly all, the editions, books, and articles that are worth naming. The article on 'Pascal' in the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS is missed, though the article on 'Grace' in that work is referred to.

Reconstruction is not to be retained for the salvation of the Church at home. There is need and there is desire for new methods in the work of the Church abroad. One of the most clear-sighted advocates of reform is the Rev. Roland Allen, M.A., sometime S.P.G. missionary in North China. Quite recently Mr. Allen wrote a revolutionary book in comparison of St. Paul's missionary methods and ours. Not less revolutionary is the new book which he has written on *Missionary Survey as an Aid to Intelligent Co-operation in Foreign Missions* (Longmans; 6s. net). Since its contents were discussed with Principal Thomas Cochrane, the title-page gives his name as joint author, but the book has been written by Mr. Allen.

Its object is to show how much more could be done with the present missionary forces if they were properly distributed and if there were proper co-operation between them. To show that is at the same time to show that the forces are not adequate for their task. But it is not the inadequacy, it is the isolation that is the trouble. Let the whole field—the field is the world—be surveyed and the facts ascertained by impartial but competent surveyors. Then let the Societies and Agencies be brought together and redistribution made with full instructions regarding co-operation. Mr. Allen brings out the elements of the

problem and sets the situation forth in clear words and simple diagrams. His work will command attention, and attention will produce reformation, for no man or woman with strong convictions is so open to correction as is the Christian missionary of our day.

'Up to now Christianity has been considered by Indians to be the religion of the conquerors; but now any one can see that Christianity is permeating every phase of India's thought. The Gospel Message no more sounds foreign to India's ears. Hence it is no great wonder that Indian Christians are beginning to feel that they ought to dispense with forms of service which do not suit their religious emotions, and worship and serve God in forms that both are Catholic and appeal to their temperament.'

And so there is a demand made for a distinctive Liturgy for the Indian Church. It is made and the reasons for it are set forth with great clearness and fairness in a book entitled *The Eucharist in India* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). The book is edited by the Rev. J. C. Winslow, M.A., who says: 'It was the present writer's happiness to have associated with him in his work in Western India a young Indian deacon who, being a person of some independent thought, felt that the Anglican Liturgy, in which he had been brought up, failed to satisfy his spiritual needs, and that some different form of liturgy was required, if the Indian instinct of worship was to be rightly used and trained.' Mr. Winslow called Mr. E. C. Ratcliff and Major J. E. G. Festing to his aid. Together they decided that a new Liturgy should be prepared (it is given in full, printed in black and red, in this volume), and that they should rely chiefly on the liturgy of the Old Syrian Church in South India, 'which is an Indian adaptation of what Dr. Adrian Fortescue considers the most beautiful liturgy in Christendom—the Greek Liturgy of St. James.' The Bishop of Bombay is in hearty agreement with the enterprise, and contributes to the volume a Preface, in which he discusses 'the relation of any such proposal as that which is made in this book to past pronouncements of the Lambeth Conference and of the Indian Synod of Bishops, the relation of uniformity to unity of worship, and the manner in which liturgical forms should grow.'

It is a most significant movement, and it loses nothing in presentation.

While we are all thinking about the Pilgrim Fathers (under the impetus of their tercentenary and the leadership of Dr. Rendel Harris), and while some of us are seeking to study their history more carefully, Messrs. Macmillan issue the very book for our purpose, Dr. R. G. Usher's *The Pilgrims and their History* ($2 net). Dr. Usher is Professor of History in Washington University. He has already published books bearing on the subject. He shows in this book that he is a thorough scholar and a quite capable writer. For his own and our satisfaction he has gone through the sources for the history of the Pilgrims again. And although he has been unable to find much new evidence 'of prime importance,' he has been able 'to place the older material about the Pilgrims in its relation to the more recent evidence concerning English church history, and he has utilized for the first time the Plymouth First Church records and many Plymouth wills, which contain much of great value on economic and social history.' He firmly believes that no more evidence will ever be found.

There is an ancient tale of an usher who confessed, after hearing many University sermons, that he still believed in God. The Dean of Winchester, Dr. W. H. Hutton, recalls it. For the sermons which he preached before the University of Oxford, and which he has now published under the title of *The Hope of Man* (Macmillan; 5s. net), must have taxed the attention of the most learned man in his audience, and left all ushers and ordinary persons in hopeless bewilderment. There is abundant classical quotation and literary allusion, and there is detailed description and criticism of Cervantes in the first sermon, of Pico della Mirandola in the second, of Augustine in the third, and of Boethius in the fourth. We are glad to read them—they make instructive and enjoyable reading—but to listen to them—*No.*

When the Rev. Francis E. Hutchinson chose *Christian Freedom* (Macmillan; 5s. net) as the subject of his Hulsean Lectures, 1918–1919, he was astonished to find that other men had chosen the same theme for other courses. There was Mr. G. G. Coulton, in eight lectures, since published as 'Christ, St. Francis, and To-day'; there was the Knightbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy in Cambridge, Dr. Sorley, in three Lay Sermons,

published with the title of 'Reconstruction and the Renewal of Life'; and some time before there was Dr. W. M. Macgregor in his Baird Lecture with Mr. Hutchinson's own title. The discovery was encouragement. A theme so much discussed must be a living theme and worth discussing.

What is it? It is the liberty with which Christ makes us free. What is that? It is the right of the Christian conscience, instructed by the Holy Spirit, to judge all things. There is no authority —Church, or Bible, or other—that can interfere. And the result? It is often disturbing. But it disturbs to rouse into life. For one thing, it enables Mr. Hutchinson to say that we are not bound by our Lord's ideas regarding demoniac possession. 'It is no longer claimed, except by a decreasing number of literalists, that Christians are bound to the beliefs which Jesus shared with his age, as, for example, in demoniac possession. As the Dean of St. Paul's has said, such current beliefs "are not themselves part of the new revelation; they belong to the soil in which it grew." While we recognize the duty of cautious reserve in our use of a method so precarious, we can hardly doubt that there are texts where we do right to appeal from the words, which were often spoken *ad hominem* and were not of the nature of "official utterances," to the spirit of Christ as we have learnt it from the Gospels as a whole and assented to it in conscience.'

In *French Ways and their Meaning* (Macmillan; 6s. net), by the American writer Edith Wharton, light is thrown on American manners as well as on French, and all the more light that it is intentional. She says: 'The very significance—the note of ridicule and slight contempt—which attaches to the word "culture" in America, would be quite unintelligible to the French of any class. It is inconceivable to them that any one should consider it superfluous, and even slightly comic, to know a great deal, to know the best in every line, to know, in fact, as much as possible.'

She holds the American woman to be in the kindergarten stage compared with the grown-up French woman. Why? Because the American woman ends her intellectual association with men at marriage. Again, she believes that the Americans and the French differ in their ideas of morality, Americans are moral in private, immoral in public (Trusts, Tammany, and the like), the French 'think the sin against the public conscience far graver than that against any private person.'

The Rev. E. Basil Redlich, M.A., Director of Religious Education in Wakefield, has written *An Introduction to Old Testament Study* (Macmillan; 6s. net). He has written it with both teachers and students in his eye, and he has succeeded in being original in idea as well as workable in practice. One original feature, quite practical too, is a series of questions and answers. They seem to touch all the really important difficulties in the interpretation of the Old Testament, and there is no hedging or hesitation. Thus:

'Question: What contradictions exist in the accounts of the battle of Beth-horon?

'Answer: Differences exist between the prose and poem versions. In the former, Sisera is a captain of Jabin, whilst in the song, Sisera is a king, not a captain (vv. 19, 29), and Jabin is not mentioned. In the prose account, two tribes unite, whilst in the poem there are five. In the former, Deborah is of the tribe of Ephraim and Barak of Naphtali, but in the latter both are of the tribe of Issachar. The poem is very ancient, and historically gives the more reliable narrative. It is curious that in c. 4 Jabin takes no part in the battle and allows the Canaanites to muster within a few miles of Hazor; it is quite possible that Jabin was introduced into the prose-version from Josh. $11^{1\text{-}15}$.'

A Little Flower of Paradise (Marshall Brothers) is the story of a beautiful childhood. Kathleen could say—did say in her own engaging language —what Katharine Tynan says:

> When I was a little child
> It was always golden weather,
> My days stretched out so long
> From rise to set of sun.
> I sang and danced, and smiled,
> My light heart like a feather,
> From morn till evensong.

In Brigands' Hands and Turkish Prisons, 1914–1918, by A. Forder (Marshall Brothers; 12s. 6d.). This is our old friend the missionary to Moab, as inconsequential and as entertaining as ever. He has a sad story to tell of his treatment by the Turks during the war. Yet he uses no strong language, for he never forgets that he is a Christian

among Muhammadans. Still more thrilling and much more pleasant is the story of the Arab rising in 1910. Mr. Forder and ten American tourists arrived in Kerak, the capital of Moab, just before the Arabs rose in anger at the tyranny of the Turks and killed the Turks in the city and looted it. How he and his American visitors got away from the place, only to fall into the hands of a robber tribe, is a romantic tale, and in his own happy-go-lucky way he tells it well. At last they were on the way to safety. 'As we rode I prayed; all I could say was, "Help, Lord; deliverance, Lord"; and when we emerged from the undergrowth on to the mud flat at the end of the Dead Sea my thanks to God found vent in some such words as these: "O thank you, Lord, you have done well, splendid; go on, Lord; we want deliverance."'

He quotes Scripture frequently, and sometimes illustrates it. He says that when he first entered the Peninsula of Sinai he was struck with the fact that the women were looking after the flocks of sheep and of goats and even the herds of camels. That explained at last the statement, which had often puzzled him, that the daughters of the priest of Midian were at the well watering their flocks when Moses came upon them. Nowhere else in Arabia do women attend to the flocks or herds.

Mr. Forder has some amusing recollections of his experience as a lecturer in England. In the end of his book (which by the way is admirably illustrated) he makes a modest appeal for his Mission.

In *Torment* (called in parenthesis 'A Study in Patriotism'), Mr. C. E. Jacomb, late Lance-Corporal in the 23rd Royal Fusiliers, describes his experiences in the great War. It is the experiences of a private soldier, and they are humiliating and horrible almost beyond endurance. Mr. Jacomb was an educated man, with sensitive nerves and refinement, and he suffered terribly. The story of the drilling and discipline is a parallel to the story which Mr. Stephen Graham told us. Mr. Jacomb carries his story right through the War. He is not vindictive and he is not weak. In some ways he sees that the system was good. In many ways the men took good out of it. He learned valuable lessons himself. He learned the most valuable of all. 'The life I led,' he says, 'and the experiences I passed through brought me to a state of mind in which the importance of religion assumed far greater proportions than it had ever done before. And if I accepted Christianity before in a non-committal kind of way, I emerged from France with a very firm belief in it, and with very good reasons on which to base this belief' (Melrose; 6s. net).

Messrs. Mills & Boon have reissued Mr. Jack London's book on the *War of the Classes* (2s. net). It is a disturbing book. For it reveals industrial situations that are not only bad but apparently beyond remedy. 'The case stands thus: There being more men than there is work for men to do, a surplus labour army inevitably results. The surplus labour army is an economic necessity; without it, present society would fall to pieces. Into the surplus labour army are herded the mediocre, the inefficient, the unfit, and those incapable of satisfying the industrial needs of the system. The struggle for work between the members of the surplus labour army is sordid and savage, and at the bottom of the social pit the struggle is vicious and beastly. This struggle tends to discouragement, and the victims of this discouragement are the criminal and the tramp. The tramp is not an economic necessity such as the surplus labour army, but he is the by-product of an economic necessity.'

Mr. Murray has published a cheap edition (7s. 6d. net) of *Hannah More: A Biographical Study*, by Annette M. B. Meakin. It is a book to be asked for, 'at all the libraries,' though it were only to make the acquaintance of Hannah More herself, a Christian gentlewoman in deed and in truth. But there is more than Hannah More in it. There is a picture of the life lived in the London of her day—the London of David Garrick, Samuel Johnson, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Horace Walpole, and a great company of learned and wealthy women—not elsewhere to be seen in greater truthfulness or clearness. One thing in the picture arrests the eye and holds it—how little organization has done for the world. The first step forward in the great march has been made by the individual nearly always and opposed by the organization.

Controversy by books is better than by pamphlets. The controversialists are more restrained;

the readers have time to think. The controversy is over those clauses in the Creed which involve interference with the order of nature—especially the Virgin Birth and the Ascension. This month Mr. A. J. C. Allen replies to Professor Bethune-Baker and supports the conservative side; this month also Dr. M. G. Glazebrook replies to the Bishop of Ely and advocates the liberal interpretation. Dr. Glazebrook's title is *The Letter and the Spirit* (Murray; 5s. net).

We must not enter the controversy and receive the redding stroke. It is enough to say that it turns upon a narrow issue. That issue is the use in Scripture of symbolical language. For example: When Scripture says that Jesus ascended into heaven and sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, does it assert a literal physical Ascent and a literal physical Seat? Dr. Glazebrook says No; the Bishop of Ely says Yes—but of course Dr. Chase would explain what he understands by 'physical' and 'literal.' It seems easiest to us in our modern atmosphere to say No, but then Dr. Glazebrook will capture and carry us away. He will carry us to the Resurrection of our Lord from the Dead. And if the Resurrection from the Dead was not physical and literal, what becomes of the narratives—the empty tomb, the clothes, the 'Touch me not,' the honeycomb, and the broiled fish? And what becomes of more than these?

'Behold the Lamb of God.'

(S. JOHN i. 29, 36).

By the Venerable C. E. Blakeway, M.A., D.D., Archdeacon of Stafford.

In Peake's *Commentary on the Bible* there occur the following comments on Jn 1^{29}:—

> 'The "Lamb of God" has been interpreted with reference (*a*) to the Paschal lamb (Ex xii.), with which the writer, like Paul (1 Cor v. 7.), identifies Jesus, but which was not a sin offering; (*b*) to the lamb of the morning and evening sacrifice; (*c*) to the lamb of Is liii. 4 ff., where the connexion with sin-bearing is certain. The Evangelist has probably interpreted and perhaps modified, in the light of later Christian thought (cf. also Gen xxii.), what originally referred to the destruction, not the "bearing" of sin.'

The above summary of opinions, and its concluding comment, sacrifices the veracity of the Evangelist; but is this necessary? The full recognition of Jesus as Messiah by John the Baptist is a well-known difficulty, and I think we must allow a certain amount of interpretative comment by the Evangelist upon the words and acts of Jesus, but it is quite another matter to credit the Evangelist with incidents and sayings devoid of any foundation. Is there anything, then, which can safeguard the general, rather than the particular, recognition of Jesus as Messiah by the Baptist, without sacrificing the veracity of 'S. John'?

In the Book of Enoch $91^{37.38}$ we read:

> 'And I saw that a white bull was born, with large horns, and all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air feared him and made petition to him all the time. And I saw till all their generations were transformed, and they all became white bulls; and the first among them became a Lamb, and the Lamb became a great animal and had black horns on its head; and the Lord of the sheep rejoiced over it and over all the oxen.'

A note on the word 'lamb' in Dr. Charles' Pseudepigrapha declares that, following Goldschmidt, the author considers the corrupt text ('word' for 'lamb') arose from the natural confusion of מלה = 'word' for טלה = 'lamb,' and refers us to the Testi-

monies of the XII. Patriarchs—Test. Joseph xix. 3–9, where § 8 in the parallel versions runs thus:

cβS 1.	A.
§ 8. And I saw that [from Judah was born]† a virgin [wearing a linen garment, and from her] was born a Lamb [without spot] and on his left hand there was as it were a lion; and all the beasts rushed against him, and the lamb overcame them, and destroyed them and trod them under foot.	And I saw in the midst of the horns a †virgin [wearing a many coloured garment and from her] went forth a Lamb; and on his right was as it were a lion; and all the beasts and all the reptiles rushed against him, and the lamb overcame them and destroyed them.
. . . . .	. . . . .
§ 11. Do ye therefore, my children, observe the commandments of the Lord, and honour Levi and Judah; for from them shall arise ⌜unto you⌝ [the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world] one who saveth [all the Gentiles and] Israel.	And do ye, my children, honour Levi and Judah; for from them shall arise the salvation of Israel.

Dr. Charles, in a footnote, questions the word 'virgin' on the grounds that it is out of place in the midst of the animal symbolism, though the word occurs in the Armenian as well as the Greek and Slavonic recensions! Borrowing, I suppose, from Enoch he would read, 'A bull calf became a Lamb.'

Again, Dr. Charles marks, as 'Christian interpolations,' all the words included within the square brackets.

Now what is the bearing of the above passages on Jn $1^{29.\ 36}$?

S. John the Baptist, it would seem, as well as our Lord Himself, was familiar, at least to some extent, with the Apocalyptic writings. There are traces of this in the central portion of John's message, wherein he proclaims a Messiah of 'Fire and Fan,' and here in two books of Apocryphal writers we have Messiah pictured as a Lamb, and may not the expression 'Lamb of God' be derived from these sources? Certain considerations make it at least probable.

1. Suppose for the sake of argument Dr. Charles is right to bracket all the words he has, the question at once arises what led the early Christians to interpolate fragments from the Baptist's message derived alone from the Fourth Gospel into a book with the single expression 'the Lamb'? It at least suggests that this description of the Messiah was current, and if in early Christian times, why not at the time of the Baptist's ministry?

2. But is it not more likely that the words 'of God' at least were in the original text, and that S. John took over from the Testaments 'the Lamb of God' as a current Messianic title? Consider one moment a peculiarity of S. John the Evangelist. In his Gospel there is a certain characteristic style which has been called 'spiral.' Again and again he describes our Lord as repeating some phrase or expression, and with each repetition some word or words of enlargement or expansion (cf. Jn $3^{3.\ 6}$ $6^{48.\ 51.\ 58}$, and passages on the Spirit in chs. 14–16), but in this case the longer form comes first (1^{29}), and 1^{36} simply has the expression 'the Lamb of God.' From which, perhaps, we may infer that the expansion 'which taketh away the sin of the world' is S. John's own interpretative comment on the original saying. Once again, if this is so, S. John does not proclaim a definition of the Messiah outside the four corners of his proclamation in the Synoptists. We are not compelled to assign to him a consciousness of a suffering Messiah, which consciousness it is very generally held to-day only grew upon our Lord Himself as He became increasingly sure of His own rejection by the Jews.

3. There is one further point. In Jn 1^{34} there is, as Professor Peake points out, a strongly attested reading, accepted by Blass, Nestle, Zahn, and Harnack, which reads for Son (υἱός), the Elect One (ἐκλεκτός) of God. But if this reading be correct, the main contention of this note, that the Baptist was conversant with the Apocryphal writers and from them got his ascription 'the Lamb of God,' receives further confirmation, for 'the Elect One' is a constant title for the Messiah in the Book of Enoch (37–71). And both terms illustrate not only, as Professor Peake says, 'how deeply the Fourth Evangelist is rooted in Jewish theology,' but even more how conversant S. John the Baptist was with the current hopes of those who were waiting for the redemption of Israel, and how accurately S. John the Evangelist recorded that knowledge.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all.'—Pr 31^{29}.

On the 12th of May 1820, there was a little girl born at Florence in Italy. She was named after her birthplace. Her family name was a very unusual one; it was *Nightingale*, so the little girl became known to the world as Florence Nightingale. Her parents had a lovely country home in England, and as a child Florence learned to love flowers, birds, and beasts. But she loved babies most of all, and was always greatly concerned when she heard of any baby she knew being sick.

She had quite a number of dolls to play with. Sometimes she imagined herself their doctor, sometimes their nurse. She bandaged the broken ones, and wrote out prescriptions for those who lay sick in bed. The very earliest piece of her hand-writing which has been preserved is a doll's prescription written in a very childish hand, '16 grains for an old woman, 11 for a young woman, and 7 for a child.'

Florence was a very serious little girl. She reminds one somewhat of Joan of Arc. When she was in her sixth year she believed that God spoke to her, and told her that she had special work to do for Him. Again and again the call came to her. Long afterwards when she wrote down some facts about her early life she said that 'God called her to His service on February 7, 1837.' She was seventeen then. It was like telling the story of her conversion. 'My idea of Heaven,' she wrote later, 'is when my dear Aunt Hannah and I and my boy Shore[1] and all of us shall be together, nursing the sick people who are left behind, and giving each other sympathies beside, and our Saviour in the midst of us, giving us strength.'[2]

But she wisely laid her plans for living for a while on this earth and trying to make a heaven of it. And it was not easy. Her father and mother had a prejudice against the profession of nursing; they disliked the idea of their daughter taking it up. They thought that in doing it she would meet a great many things to make her unhappy. The nurses of those days were, with few exceptions, very unlike the kind women who nursed our boys on the battlefield. They were not gentle. So many of them indeed were rough, and careless of their patients, that the name of 'Sarah Gamp,' of whom many of you must have heard, became proverbial. Florence Nightingale loved her father and mother, but nothing would induce her to give up the ideal that God had set before her.

If beautiful surroundings could have brought happiness, she had these at her own home. She loved painting and sculpture. Her money enabled her to visit the greatest Picture Galleries and see the finest examples of Sculpture in the world; these, however, but brought her a clearer revelation of God's will, and she became firmer than ever in her determination to fulfil what she believed to be His commands. About 1849, when the French troops besieged Rome on behalf of the Pope, who had fled, she happened to be in Italy. Every one was saying how careless it was for the Romans to expose their beautiful monuments and buildings to the assaults of the enemy. Florence Nightingale showed herself a woman inspired by the same spirit that sent our noble young soldiers to fight in the Great War, ready to face the loss of everything in their determination that wrong should not prevail. 'They must carry out their defence to the last,' she cried. 'I should like to see them fight the streets inch by inch till the last man dies at his barricade, till St. Peter's is level with the ground, till the Vatican is blown into the air. . . . If I were in Rome, I should be the first to fire the Sistine Chapel, and Michael Angelo would cry "Well done!" as he saw his work destroyed.'

Florence Nightingale was a heroine. She could never turn back. 'O God,' she wrote in her diary, 'Thou puttest into my heart this great desire to devote myself to the sick and sorrowful. I offer it to Thee. Do with it what is for Thy service.' And although she craved for the sympathy of her mother and sister, a verse from the New Testament made her way plain, 'He that loveth father and mother more than me is not worthy of me.'

She went and had a period of training on the

[1] A relative.

[2] E. T. Cook, *The Life of Florence Nightingale*, i. 44.

Continent, then on her return she became superintendent of a nursing home for governesses in London. But the chance of her life came when, after the battle of Alma, news reached this country that no proper preparations had been made for the treatment of the sick and wounded. There were no bandages, no nursing appliances for even the commonest surgical operations. In some cases, even a week might pass before medical attendance was procured for the poor sufferers. Florence Nightingale offered to go to the Crimea to nurse the men; she offered also to find a party of nurses who would accompany her. Her ability was well known: her offer was accepted, and she went. Many messages came to her before she set out. 'God speed you on your errand of mercy, my own dearest child.' 'God bless you, my dear friend, wherever you go.' It was not easy work she had undertaken. The nurses under her were difficult; they did not understand obedience as it is understood in the army, as our brave army nurses did.

The story of her work at Scutari reveals her as a queen among nurses. She had a will of iron, but a tender heart of love. The men regarded her with reverence. 'Before she came,' said one soldier's letter, 'there was cussin' and swearin', but after that it was holy as a church.' Some of them idolized her. They kissed her shadow as she passed carrying her little lamp, and they saluted her as she walked down their wounded ranks. 'If the Queen came for to die,' said a soldier who lost a leg at the Alma, 'they ought to make her queen, and I think they would.' An Irish clergyman was asked to what sect she belonged. 'She belonged to a sect which unfortunately is a very rare one—the sect of the Good Samaritan.'

Florence Nightingale felt that her first duty was to God. Her aim was to leave the world better than she found it. And that, I hope, will be your aim also. Are your schoolmates better for knowing you? When they part from you, will they remember that you were strong for the right, but gentle and kind if they happened to be in trouble?

The following beautiful incident was recorded in a London paper of August 16, 1910:

At Chelsea, under the lime tree's stir,
I read the news to a pensioner
That a noble lord and a judge were dead—
'They were younger men than me,' he said.

I read again of another death;
The old man turned, and caught his breath—
'She's gone?' he said; 'she too? In camp
We called her the Lady of the Lamp.'

He would not listen to what I read,
But wanted it certain—'The Lady's dead?'
I showed it him to remove his doubt,
And added, unthinking, 'The Lamp is out.'

He rose—and I had to help him stand—
Then, as he saluted with trembling hand,
I was abashed to hear him say,
'The Lamp she lit is alight to-day.'[1]

A False and a True Measure.

'But they themselves, measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves with themselves, are without understanding.'—2 Co 10^{12}.

I wonder how many of you get measured regularly by your father or mother. Are you ever made to take off your shoes and stand very straight and erect with your back against a door while a book is laid on the top of your head and a little pencil mark is put on the door underneath the book?

I once knew a family of four children who used to be measured like that every three months or so. The marks were made on the inside of a big cupboard door in the schoolroom, and the name of each child and the date was written alongside like this: Mabel, 1st March 1911; Margaret, 4th June 1912; Norah, 2nd September 1912; Jim, 1st December 1913.

Each time they were measured the younger ones used to count back to see how much bigger or smaller they were than the older ones at the same age. Mabel, the eldest, was very tall and nobody could ever beat her, and poor little Jim who was the youngest was also the smallest for his age. He never seemed to manage to be as big as any of his sisters had been at his age, but I can remember his glee when one day he came and told me that at last he was *really and truly* a quarter of an inch taller than Margaret had been when she was seven.

These children were 'measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves with themselves,' and I think that kind of measuring is very interesting and harmless. But there is another

[1] A. Matheson, *Florence Nightingale*, 358.

kind of measuring that is not quite so good, and it was this measuring and comparing that St. Paul meant when he wrote this letter to the Corinthian Church. There was a little set in the Church at Corinth who thought their way of doing things was the only right way. They measured themselves by themselves, instead of measuring themselves by something much higher or nobler, and so they never grew any better or wiser. They had a false measure and it led them to become proud, and self-satisfied, and overbearing.

Now we are all in danger of making the same mistake, and so I want to speak to you about the False Measure, and after we have finished talking about that, I want to tell you about the True Measure.

1. The false way of measuring is to measure ourselves by ourselves. And the reason why it is false is that none of us are perfect.

Once upon a time there was a gentleman who owned a beautiful Chinese plaque. It was ornamented with all sorts of queer dragons, and he valued it very highly. But one day the plaque fell from the wall where it was hanging and it broke in two right down the middle. Some time after, this gentleman had a chance of sending the plaque out to China and of ordering six more. In order that they might be exactly like the broken one, he packed the two bits of it very carefully and sent them out as a copy. A few months later a box arrived from China containing the plaques. Very eagerly he unpacked it, and what do you think he saw? Six plaques exactly the same size as his own one; ornamenting them, exactly the same dragons in exactly the same colours; and down the centre of each plaque—a crack exactly like the break down the middle of the original!

That makes you laugh, but do you know that you are just as silly when you copy the mistakes in other people's characters? So don't do wrong things just because others are doing them, don't measure your conscience by theirs.

2. Just a few words about the True Measure. If we are not to compare ourselves with ourselves, with whom are we to compare ourselves? Well, God has given us a Perfect Example, a True Measure to guide us. He sent Jesus down to earth to show us how we should live, and if we measure ourselves by Him we can never make any mistake.

There is an ancient legend which tells of a wonderful statue of Christ. This statue seemed to be the height of an ordinary man, but whoever measured himself with it always found it just a little taller than himself.

Jesus is above us all because He wants to lift us up. If we keep looking up to Him and trying to imitate Him we shall grow better and braver and kinder, but if we never try to rise above the earthly standard, the chances are that we shall get less noble and brave and good as the years go on.

Once a lady missionary took a little Hindoo orphan boy to live with her. She taught him about Jesus, and one night when he was six years old she told him he might pray a prayer of his own. What do you think he said? 'Dear Jesus, make me like what you were when you were six years old.' Jesus came to earth to show not only men and women, but also boys and girls, how they should live. We are apt to think of Him as a grown man doing kind deeds and speaking wise words, but He was once just as old as you are. And I think none of the boys and girls could pray a better prayer than just this: 'Dear Jesus, make me like what you were when you were my age.'

The One Thing Needful.

'But one thing is needful.'—Lk 10^{42}.

You all know what it is to have special friends. You know how you love to go and see them, and how happy you are when they come to visit you. And you have heard father and mother talking about *their* special friends, and saying how nice it was to have So-and-so 'dropping in' of an evening.

Now Christ had special friends too when He lived on earth. There was one house where He knew He could go at any moment and find a welcome. It was the house of two sisters called Martha and Mary. We are told that Jesus loved Martha and Mary and their brother Lazarus. They lived at Bethany, a little village about half an hour's walk from Jerusalem. And in the cool of the evening, after Christ's day's work of preaching and healing was done, He would often walk out to Bethany to refresh Himself by a talk with His friends.

On the evening of which our text tells Jesus had perhaps taken a few of His disciples with Him, for, when He arrived, there arose a great

bustle in the house. Martha, who prided herself on her housekeeping and her cooking, began to rush here and there and to prepare a great spread in honour of her guests. It was very kind of her, but she did not understand, even although she loved Jesus dearly, that it was not fine food He was hungering for. She never saw that it was the love and sympathy of His friends that He was craving.

But her sister Mary saw. She loved Jesus in a more understanding way than did Martha. She loved Him in a more understanding way than did even His disciples who were with Him all the time. She saw how He was longing for sympathy and friendship, so she sat down at His feet (as the Jews did at the feet of their Rabbis or teachers), and she listened to Him and talked to Him of the things that matter most in the world—God's love for men, and men's love for God, and how loving God we love men, and loving men we love God. And perhaps Jesus told her how He had come to show men what God is like, so that it might be easier for men to love God.

In any case, Mary got so absorbed listening and talking to Christ that she was deaf to all the clatter and fuss that Martha was making. She never noticed how hot and tired and cross her sister was growing. But Martha was not too busy to notice Mary. Each time she flew into the room and noisily set extra dishes on the table, she gave a look at Mary sitting at the Master's feet; and each time her wrath grew hotter till at last it boiled over. She bustled up and said sharply to Jesus, 'You don't seem to care how busy I am. Don't you see that Mary should be helping me instead of sitting there doing nothing?'

Jesus looked at poor angry Martha, and then He smiled and shook His head. 'Martha, Martha,' said He gently, 'I'm afraid you are worrying yourself unnecessarily cooking extra dainties for me. Don't you know that I'd rather just share your usual meal? There is no need to make a feast. One dish is quite enough. Did I say one dish?—Ah, Martha, don't you see that the one thing I want most in the world is not food but the thing that Mary is offering me—a loving and understanding heart?'

Boys and girls, Christ still comes to visit His friends. He comes to our heart as our guest any day. What do we offer Him? Do we think it necessary to make a great fuss before we can entertain Him? Do we think we must bring Him this thing or that?

There is only one thing He asks for. It is the thing that Mary gave Him long ago, the welcome of a loving and an understanding heart.

'I wish everybody saw me with Grandpapa's eyes,' sighed a little maiden when some one found fault with her. Grandpapa's eyes were the understanding eyes of love. Let us try to see Jesus with Mary's eyes, then perhaps we shall be worthy of the friendship and the comradeship He offers each one of us.

The Christian Year.

The Sunday after Ascension.

All with One Accord.

'And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.'—Acts 2^1.

Human progress, real, persistent, human progress, depends upon the breeze from heaven. That is the first truth emphasized. When the day of Pentecost was fully come they were all with one accord in one place. They had done nothing as far as aggression and organization were concerned. They had not ventured outside the limits of Jerusalem. The great world lay there around them, ready for their attack, and still they tarried and tarried in Jerusalem. Their vessel was in the harbour, and they dare not venture out to sea until they got the heavenly breezes that had been promised them.

1. Who are included in the comprehensive word 'all'? Many of them are named in the previous chapter. We find the old familiar names representing the familiar presences of Peter, James, and John, Andrew and Philip and Thomas. 'With the women.' The Magdalene was there! 'And Mary the mother of Jesus.' This is the last mention of her in the sacred story; the record leaves her praying! 'With his brethren.' How revolutionary is the statement. We think of another sentence descriptive of the brethren in an earlier day: 'Even his brethren did not believe on him!' And yet here they are, with their unbelief banished, and humbled into a quiet and yet fervent expectancy.

2. 'These all with one accord continued steadfastly in prayer.' It was not yet that unity which they afterwards had when knit together by the Holy

Ghost. It was like the unity of people bound together by common feelings or common objects and dangers. They were gathered together in the expectation of a blessing. The promise of a Comforter had been given to all. The words of Christ had been addressed to the apostles collectively, and in a body they waited for the gift.

God has said to us, 'Wheresoever two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst.' If we were more like these apostles in uniting, and not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, who knows what glorious blessings we might have from heaven? The ten days that intervened between the Ascension and the fulfilment of the Saviour's promise were days, no doubt, full of trial. Christ had gone, and as each day passed no sign of coming aid was seen. Still they prayed and waited with submissive wills, because their hearts were full of faith.

3. There is a mystic commerce altogether independent of human expedient or arrangement. We cannot bow together without some exchange of heavenly merchandise, without angel-ministries carrying from island to island the unique and peculiar products of their climes. The rich and enriching history of the Society of Friends is altogether corroborated of this great truth of spiritual experience. 'When I came into the silent assemblies of God's people,' says Robert Barclay, 'I felt a sweet power among them which touched my heart, and as I gave way unto it, I found the evil weakening in me and the good raised up.' But the human side of the apostolic *koinonia* includes riches other than these. It is not only a mystic interchange in the awful depths of the spirit; it is a fellowship of intelligence, it is a community of experience, it is the socializing of the individual testimony and witness. It is not only the subtle carriage of spiritual energy, it is the transference of visions, the sharing of discoveries, the assemblage of many judgments, whether in the hour of triumph or of defeat.

What a prayer-meeting it must have been! Who has not cherished the wish that some of these prayers had been preserved? We should all have rejoiced to know how Thomas prayed. What a strength there must have been in the prayers of a man who had wrestled long and slain his doubts! What passion there must have been in Peter's intercession! How deep and grave and quiet must have been the love in the pleas of the Magdalene! And how sweet and reverent must have been the serenity of 'Mary the mother of Jesus.' And what would they all pray for? Surely they would concentrate upon the promised power. They had recently heard the Master Himself say, 'Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you.' And so they just opened out their hearts and their minds in the posture of receptiveness, and they helped to foster in one another the hungry disposition. And is it not very likely that one day, in the very midst of their devotions, Mary the mother of Jesus would repeat a word which she had spoken to them on an earlier day, 'Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it'? But to-day there would be an infinitely more willing obedience than in the days when the discipleship began. Mary had no sooner repeated the words than the heart of every suppliant was prostrate in willing surrender. No command had yet been given! They were not yet called upon for the acts, but for the attitude of consecration. 'Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it!' And their hearts were bowed in homage. Here, then, was this assembly, one in purpose, steadfast in prayer, and bowed in the very posture of consecration. 'All things are now ready.'[1]

Whitsunday.

The Symbol of the Wind.

'And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.'—Acts 2^2.

1. At Pentecost a new and strange thing happened to this company of Jesus' disciples. There came to them suddenly, to all of them, a vivid sense of their Master's presence—an unseen power within them, laying hold of their spirits. It affected the whole gathering in that place and showed itself in strange fashion. 'There came from heaven' (that was the Spirit-source from which it really sprang) 'a sound (or sigh) as of a great rushing wind.' This sound pervaded the assembly, as if it were an escaping of their pent-up spiritual emotions.

2. It was a supernatural moment in the Upper Room. The powers of a new life, the forces of a new kingdom, were coming into operation, and, as the result, manifestations that never since have been experienced found place among men. We can find a parallel to what then happened in scientific investigations. Geologists and astronomers push back the beginning of the world and of the universe at large to a vast distance, but they all acknowledge that there must have been a period when phenomena were manifested, powers and forces called into operation, of which men have now no experience. The beginning, or the repeated beginnings, of the various epochs must have been times of marvels, which men can now

[1] J. H. Jowett, in *The Examiner*, January 26, 1905.

only dream about. Pentecost was for the Christian with a sense of the awful importance of life and of time and of the individual soul a far greater beginning and a grander epoch than any mere material one. It was the beginning of the spiritual life, the inauguration of the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah, the Lord and Ruler of the material universe; and therefore we ought to expect, or at least not to be surprised, that marvellous phenomena, signs and wonders, even of a physical type, should accompany and celebrate the scene. The marvels of the story told in the first chapter of Genesis find a parallel in the marvels told in the second chapter of Acts. The one passage sets forth the foundation of the material universe, the other proclaims the nobler foundations of the spiritual universe.

3. There are two ways of describing an event, one statistical and the other symbolical. They are as different as photography is different from painting. The statistical narrative gives us the plain facts as they would have been reflected in a mirror, had one been hanging on the wall. The symbolical narrative gives us the facts interpreted, and to them adds still other facts of an intangible and spiritual sort, such as no looking-glass has ever seen, and for which there is no descriptive language except such as is used by poets and artists.

That which happened at Pentecost was too great to be put into the common phrases of matter-of-fact narration. To say simply that, being there assembled and praying, the hearts of the disciples were suddenly and wonderfully affected with an unusual sense of the presence of God, was not enough. The historian becomes a poet. The winds blow and the fires blaze. The dullest reader perceives that something extraordinary is taking place. That is the effect which the writer intends to produce.

And the symbol of the wind is but the putting into picturesque form of the idea that lies in the name. 'Spirit' is 'breath.' Wind is but air in motion. Breath is the synonym for life. 'Spirit' and 'life' are two words for one thing. So then, in the symbol, the 'rushing mighty wind,' we have set forth the highest work of the Spirit—the communication of a new and supernatural life.

We are carried back to that grand vision of the prophet who saw the bones lying, very many and very dry, sapless and disintegrated, a heap dead and ready to rot. The question comes to him: 'Son of man! Can these bones live?' The only possible answer, if he consult experience, is 'O Lord God! Thou knowest.' Then follows the great invocation: 'Come from the four winds, O Breath! and breathe upon these slain that they may live.' And the Breath comes, and 'they stand up, an exceeding great army.' 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth.' The Scripture treats us all as dead, being separated from God, unless we are united to Him by faith in Jesus Christ. According to the saying of the Evangelist, 'They which believe on Him receive' the Spirit, and thereby receive the life which He gives, or, as our Lord Himself speaks, are 'born of the Spirit.' The highest and most characteristic office of the Spirit of God is to enkindle this new life, and hence His noblest name, among the many by which He is called, is the Spirit of life.[1]

4. The disciples experienced a new atmosphere. When the Holy Spirit comes it is like that in the soul. The wind that blows across the earth is full of vitalizing strength. It is glorious to walk bare-headed in the wind! And to expose the 'naked spirit' to the mighty wind of God's Spirit is to have all the drowsiness driven out of the soul, and to be aroused into newness and freshness of life. The will is braced, and so is the conscience, and so are the affections, and so is the perception of God, the grip of the Infinite. However deep the sleep may be, however inveterate the drowsiness, they are not unmovable. It is a 'mighty wind,' and nothing can resist it.

Mony a win' there has been sent
Oot aneth the firmament—
Ilka ane its story has;
Ilka ane began an' was;
Ilka ane fell quaiet an' mute
Whan its angel wark was oot:
First gaed ane oot throu the mirk
Whan the maker gan to work;
Ower it gaed an' ower the sea,
An' the warl begud to be.
Mony ane has come an' gane
Sin' the time there was but ane:
Ane was grit an' strang, an' rent
Rocks an' muntains as it went
Afore the Lord, his trumpeter,
Waukin up the prophet's ear;
Ane was like a stepping soun
I' the mulberry taps abune—
Them the Lord's ain steps did swing,
Walkin on afore his king;
Ane comes frae his hert to mine
Ilka day to mak it fine.
Breath o' God, eh! come an' blaw
Frae my hert ilk fog awa;

[1] A. Maclaren, *Expositions of Holy Scriptures*, Acts i.–xii. 48.

Wauk me up an' mak me strang,
Fill my hert wi' mony a sang,
Frae my lips again to stert
Fillin sails o' mony a hert,
Blawin them ower seas dividin
To the only place to bide in.[1]

TRINITY SUNDAY.

The Holy Spirit.

'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.'—Acts 2^{38}.

The history of the introduction of a new spiritual era is always full of interest and fascination, and, above all, the introduction of that greatest change of all, when the kingdom of God became established through the incarnation of God upon this earth. Then there came into the world, in as far as anything could be new, new ideas, new forces, new facts, new conceptions, new motives, and new incentives to action. Human life was revolutionized by the coming of the Son of Man. So the history of the New Testament, for every inquiring and devout mind, is one of surpassing interest. A new heaven and a new earth are being created, and it is a matter of infinite interest to notice how it relates itself to the old world that is passing away.

1. He errs greatly who thinks that the Christian religion stops with the resurrection. There was a time when the disciples supposed that it stopped there. When Jesus passed into the cloud which received Him from human sight, His disciples stood rooted to the ground gazing steadfastly into the heavens into which their Master had gone. And while they stood there they received this reprimand from two men robed in white, 'Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus which is taken from you into heaven shall come again.'

The end of life, according to Jesus, is not a thought, but an action. The supreme thing is not information, but conduct. The most urgent and critical question which we have to face is not any question of Biblical criticism or Christian philosophy, but, can a man in the first decade of the twentieth century live the Christ life? and can a man here and now do the work which God would have him do? All other questions sink into insignificance compared with this one. Is it possible for a man at all times and in all circumstances to live a life which shall be well pleasing to God? But before the question has left our lips, the Christian religion throws back the full-toned, jubilant answer, 'Yes.' And if we ask, How is this great thing possible? she immediately replies, 'By the power of the Holy Spirit.'[2]

2. No writer in the New Testament emphasizes the personality of the Holy Spirit as Luke does. In the Gospels, when Matthew says, 'If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father who is in heaven give *good things* to them who ask him,' Luke prefers to summarize all other good gifts in the greatest gift of God to man, and he says, 'Your heavenly Father' will 'give *the Holy Spirit* to them that ask him.' The Holy Spirit is the best of all 'good things' in Luke's estimation; and his second volume is a prolonged proof of the justification of this standpoint. We never would have known about the baptism at Pentecost, if Luke had not written this history; for no other book in the New Testament makes mention of it. The baptism with the Spirit marked the beginning of the new dispensation, a dispensation which has had no end as yet.

3. There is no article in the Christian creed which it is more difficult to deal with, and concerning which more perplexing and unanswerable questions rise than just that little article which is repeated so easily, and, perhaps, so thoughtlessly, 'I believe in the Holy Spirit.' Whenever we begin to think about this subject, we enter the realm of mystery, and Jesus acknowledged all this in His conversation with Nicodemus. Before he talked long with the citizen of Jerusalem, Nicodemus began to use the great adverb 'how,' a word which springs spontaneously to the lips of every man who thinks. And Jesus at once informed him that there was no answer to his question. Certain things *are* simply because they *are*. They are not to be philosophized about until they have been acted on. A man must be born of the Spirit. If you ask the question, How? the answer is, He must be born of the Spirit. If you say it is a mystery, the answer is, You speak truly, but the world is full of mystery. Even such a common thing as the wind is a mystery. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.'

But while we move amid great mysteries there are certain things clear as the sun at noon. God

[1] George MacDonald, 'Win' that blaws' (*Works*, ii. 410).

[2] C. E. Jefferson, *Things Fundamental*.

does not answer all the questions we may choose to ask; but He gives us light by which it is possible for us to walk.

If we are to disbelieve in the spiritual world because it is filled with mystery, what are we to say of the mysteries which face us on this earth—inexplicable yet undeniable? The conception of God is not more mysterious than the thought that a grain of sand may be divided a million times, and yet be no nearer its ultimate division than it is now. Time and space are full of mystery. A man under chloroform has been known to pass many hours of sensation in a few minutes. Time is made an objective measure of things, and yet its phenomena are so subjective that Kant conceived it to have no real existence.[1]

4. Had there been no Pentecost, there would have been no Christian Church. Men sometimes say that there are two great days in the Christian year—Christmas and Easter—the day that commemorates the birth of Jesus, and the day that commemorates His rising from the tomb. Those are great days, to be sure; but they do not exhaust the list, there is another day as great as either, and without which the first two would amount to little. There are three great days in the Christian year: Christmas, Easter, Whitsunday, and we are not true to our faith when we allow Whitsunday to fall into the background.

It is only by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit that the Christian life becomes possible to any one of us. We are not made Christians by ideas, but by the Spirit who dwells within us.

I believe in Thee!
Life's Lord, Life's Giver,
For aye and ever.
Source and Fountain of boundless sanctity,
Pouring high sapience and wisdom royally
Down on Thy suppliant people, the blest, the free:
Thou who art fain to hallow all men, oh, hallow me,
My God, I believe in Thee.[2]

First Sunday after Trinity.

Prayer in Spirit.

'Pray without ceasing.'—1 Th 5^{17}.

If we would pray without ceasing, it must be in the spirit, and not in words; and if we consider what is the essential spirit of prayer, we may be more disposed to admit the reasonableness of the apostolic precept.

1. Self-consecration to God is the inmost characteristic of true prayer. It is an offering up of the heart, with all its desires and affections, to Him who is its rightful Lord. Without this our imploring words are only a deceitful semblance, and it would be better to keep our tongues for ever silent than to besiege heaven with our short-sighted and selfish petitions. Prayer indeed, as the expression of a desire, naturally assumes the form of petition; but if it be genuine, every request is accompanied by the condition, either expressed or implied, that it be agreeable to God's wisdom and love to grant it. 'Thy kingdom come; thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven,' expresses the substance of all real prayer.

2. Again, trust is a characteristic of true prayer. That we offer prayer at all is dependent on our conviction that there is One who is both able and willing to give us what we need. If we were atheists, we could not pray; and each prayer that breaks involuntarily from the lips is a protest of nature against every atheistic scheme. Nor could we approach God with the language of supplication if, while we admitted His existence, we believed that He had no regard for individual welfare, and that our most earnest pleadings would pass unheeded away. Nor again, if we only dreaded God's sovereign power, and sought by our entreaties to secure His favour, could we offer the prayer of self-consecration; for we can consecrate ourselves only to One whom we believe to be infinitely good and holy. Nothing short of the Christian's faith in a Heavenly Father can justify the Christian's prayer; and if that faith be feeble and uncertain in our hearts, our words will be cold and languid. The fervent, heartfelt prayer which is acceptable to God is full of childlike trust.

3. Once more, true prayer is characterized by humility. He only who is conscious of need, and feels his dependence on a higher Power, approaches God in prayer. As long as we are sufficient for ourselves we may use the prescribed form, and draw nigh to God with our lips, but our hearts will be far from Him. It is when earth no longer satisfies, when aspiration sighs for an ideal good, or the shame of conscious weakness or guilt enters our souls, that we utter the prayer which pierces to the audience-chamber of God. If we are so vain and presumptuous as to think that we need Him not, but can live by our own light and strength, our pharisaical offering will drop back like lead into our own bosoms. We must feel our depend-

[1] *Tennyson and his Friends*, 235.
[2] E. Hickey, 'An Act of Faith,' *Later Poems*, 52.

ence upon God, our infinite need of His blessing, and that all wisdom, power, and love are His gifts, before we can address Him in the accents of sincere prayer, and present to Him all the wealth of a son's devotion.

We need the control of prayer in the hour of relaxation and pleasure, that nothing may be done in excess, nothing unworthy, but the true end of pleasure may be secured, the possession of a healthier and gladder mind. How many would be saved from making shipwreck of their character if they sought no pleasure on which the blessing of God was not secretly implored. And let it not be said that thus enjoyment would become stiff and unnatural. On the contrary, it would assume a spontaneous grace, and fill the heart with delight a thousandfold. What mirth so keen and genuine as that of a happy child? And has God no smile for the merry gambols and laughter of childhood? If the thought of God will not blend with our amusements, they are not innocent, and we must flee from them. To pray without ceasing is our only safeguard here.

The same is true of the more serious engagements of our life's business. Here, too, the prayerful spirit should be ever present. How prone we are to view our profession, whatever it may be, as the means of self-aggrandizement, and not as a trust committed to us by God, to be carried on in strict conformity with His will. Hence arises, even among men otherwise good, a laxity of practice on which they themselves cannot think with complacency, and which they excuse rather than justify. The delicate sense of honour is lost, and self-interest steps into the place of duty. Let our warehouses, our shops, our studies become temples, not indeed for the offering of formal worship, but for that noiseless communion and that trustful self-surrender which alone can impart to life its true dignity and value, and mingle unseen in all our pursuits.[1]

[1] J. Drummond, *Pauline Meditations*.

The Samaritans.[2]

By the Reverend A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Semitic Languages in the University of Edinburgh.

Dr. Thomson's interest in the Samaritans is of long standing (see The Expository Times, vol. xi. 375 ff.). 'The present work,' to quote from the preface, 'represents the results of independent study pursued somewhat intermittently for nearly thirty years, and in circumstances more favourable to acquiring information than are possessed by many. A somewhat lengthened residence in Palestine, repeated visits to Nablus, and presence at the celebration of the Samaritan Passover, vitalized to the writer ideas derived by him from other sources.' The result is this full and sympathetic presentation of the history, literature, and religious beliefs and practices of the Samaritans from the earliest times down to the present day. By this substantial addition to the scanty literature of the subject in English, Dr. Thomson has earned the gratitude of all who are interested not only in the present pathetic remnant of a once numerous race, but in such wider questions as the claim of the older Samaritans to represent the ancient 'house of Joseph,' with rites and beliefs that are possibly a direct inheritance from the priests and prophets of North Israel, and, not least, the literary and textual problems presented by the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch.

In the opening chapters Dr. Thomson gives an excellent sketch of the history of the Samaritan community, while chapter v., 'The Ritual of Samaritan Worship,' and chapter vii., 'The Theology of the Samaritans,' are perhaps the most valuable in the whole work. In the former chapter will be found a graphic description of that most interesting survival from a remote antiquity, the celebration of the Passover on

[2] *The Samaritans: Their Testimony to the Religion of Israel.* Being the Alexander Robertson Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1916, by the Rev. J. E. H. Thomson, D.D., Author of *Books which influenced the Lord and His Apostles* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd. Price 16s.).

Mt. Gerizim, as witnessed by the author in 1898.[1]

Dr. Thomson, however, has other ends in view in this volume than merely an historical study of the Samaritans. He is one of the few really competent Old Testament scholars who still hold out against the now dominant view of the history of the Pentateuch and its legislation associated with the names of Graf and Wellhausen. In the religious rites of the Samaritans, and, above all, in the history of their Pentateuch, Dr. Thomson finds, as the title of his book is meant to indicate, conclusive evidence of the great antiquity of the Pentateuch in its present form.

To summarize the arguments—some new, others familiar and often refuted—advanced in support of this position would far exceed the limits of this review. Scouting the idea that the Samaritans could have accepted the Pentateuch from their bitter enemies, the Jews, in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, Dr. Thomson believes he has proved that the ten tribes were in possession of the complete Torah before the fall of Samaria, on the ground, mainly, that the sacrificial terminology used by Amos and Hosea presupposes acquaintance on their part with the terminology peculiar to the Priests' Code. He is on more original lines when, after an exhaustive discussion of the development of the Hebrew alphabet, and an informing examination of typical textual variations between the Samaritan and Massoretic recensions of the Pentateuch, he concludes that these must have parted company not later than the reign of Solomon. It is scarcely necessary to say that the material as yet available for the study of early Hebrew epigraphy is much too limited to permit of so definite a conclusion. Even more precarious seems the argument, novel and ingenious though it be, drawn from the non-pronunciation of the characteristic Hebrew gutturals by the Samaritans, which, it is here maintained, is due to Phœnician influence, and takes us back to the period when the Greeks borrowed their alphabet from the Phœnicians.

However, when all is said against the author's main thesis, the fact remains that Dr. Thomson has given us an original and stimulating book. He has laid bare not a few weak places in the modern critical position, and has opened up lines of investigation demanding the closer attention of future students.

Attention may be called, in conclusion, to the four useful appendixes, and to the first in particular, which consists of a descriptive catalogue of all the known manuscripts of the Samaritan-Hebrew Pentateuch, including a list, here given for the first time, of those preserved in the Rylands Library in Manchester.

[1] With this description, and with Dr. Thomson's exposition of the points in which the Samaritan observance differs from that of the Jews before the destruction of their Temple in A.D. 70, should be compared the latest account by a Swedish observer in Dalman's *Palästinajahrbuch* for 1912 (pp. 104–120) with the editor's competent study entitled: 'The Samaritan Passover in relation to the Jewish,' on pp. 121–138.

The Neglected Interpreter.

By the Reverend John Douglas.

Let it be said at once that the title of this paper applies to the study of the Foreign Missionary History of the last generation or two, the study of the emergence in non-Christian lands of the Christian Church, and to the study of present-day conditions, both in policy and in practice, on the Foreign Field. It is this manifold study which is here set forth as the neglected interpreter of the Bible and especially of the New Testament.

It is recognized on all hands, both within the Church and without, that the teaching ministry of the pulpit urgently requires to be revised and revivified. For ours is a time of renewed sifting and revision, not least in the region of Christian thought and doctrine; and critical inquiry into revelations, laws, and gospels, their very presuppositions as well as their claims and authorities, is busy all about us in the disturbed and unsettled atmosphere which the Great War has produced. The Church and especially the pulpit have to meet this, if they are to make an adequate response to

the needs of our time. Preaching, in other words, must anew give prominence to the exposition of the fundamental Christian doctrines, and of the historic basis of these doctrines; while at the same time the authority of the Christian ethic, linked (as it must be) with the doctrine, requires anew to be declared and interpreted. And this in a living, vitalizing, and practical fashion.

Now back of this lie nothing less than a thorough restudy and reinterpretation of the New Testament itself—I mean on the part of the average minister of the Churches. It is, no doubt, an extremely elementary thing to say, by way of reminder, that the New Testament is history from first to last; it is so hardly less in its development of doctrine than in the directly historical sections. And this elementary fact about the New Testament really requires to be emphasized, when one recalls how largely it is handled merely as a text-book in the pulpit. How many preachers avail themselves, as it is only fair to their subject that they should, of the results of modern historical analysis, and the rich light which these results throw upon the Book? Yet at the back and as the basis of accurate and illuminating Christian preaching and teaching there ought to be, and there is no excuse to-day for there not being, the live and conscientious use of the light of interpretation just referred to.

Now if—as is here claimed—this be indeed the case, here, in 'the neglected interpreter,' there lies to hand a very treasure-trove of enlightenment and inspiring exposition of the New Testament history and Church development and development of doctrine. For in the history, and especially in the more recent history, of Foreign Missions, and in the situation produced by the emergence of the Church on the Foreign Field, and in the problems raised by the impact of Christianity upon the non-Christian religions and peoples and civilizations, you have almost New Testament history repeating itself in a vivid, fascinating, illuminating pageant which acts out again the very process which is apparent in the making—and in the life which is behind the making—of the New Testament.

As you survey the Foreign Field you meet conditions and needs, a whole situation, which is surprisingly similar to those into which the Gospel and the Apostles fared forth in the first and second centuries. You have, for instance, the Christian evangel to-day working its leaven into masses of thought and life in Islam and Hinduism, which reproduce in a remarkable degree the process by which, on the one hand, the work and thought of the Apostle Paul were conceived and achieved under the stress and strain of Judaism; and, on the other hand, the process by which St. John especially and the Fathers met and adapted and conquered Hellenism. Or again you have, to take a less general example, a wealth of illustration in this neglected interpreter to bring to the understanding of the whole question of Demons and Devil-Possession in its bearing upon the gladness and the glory of the Christian salvation—a very real factor in the religion which finds its reflexion in the glow of page after page of the New Testament. And the more you realize of the meeting to-day of Christianity with the world's Animistic religions, the more you understand of the liberations, the relief, the hopefulness, the birth of enterprise which burn and shine in chapter upon chapter of New Testament religion and life.

There is another aspect of this which falls to be noted in a sketch of the subject. It is that both the call for, and abundant aid in, the rethinking and the restatement of our theology come from the Foreign Field. There, as in the first four centuries of our era, the demand has to be met increasingly for a formulation of Christian theology in view of the philosophies and theologies which the missionary must encounter and overthrow, at the same time finding always his avenues of approach towards and points of contact with non-Christian religions. And he knows that the necessity is upon the Church, if she would but recognize it, of presenting to the world her reconsidered programme of thought, her theological 'platform,' a programme drawn out of her freshest understanding of the past and her newest experience of her resources in God and the gospel of His Grace in Jesus Christ. Christianity facing Islam, for instance, is called upon to declare afresh, and with freedom from the tyranny of easily misunderstood words, the doctrines of the Personality and the Freedom of God and the doctrine of the Trinity. While, to indicate a single other illustration of what I mean, even the Animistic religions in their call upon the Christian gospel suggest an earnest rethinking of our relationship, and the whole problem involved, towards God in prayer. These are one or two among many points at which the demand for theological restatement is made. Now this restatement has to be gone about and made in view of the missionary

aspect of the Church's life, in view of the growing emergence of the Church in non-Christian lands. It will not do—we learn it from the Foreign Field—to undertake the task of restatement as in behalf of the Home Churches. The day for that is past. And the task to-day must be faced with a definite and wide outlook to the far-flung lines of the Church's campaign; not merely a view confined to pulpits and colleges and classes at home. The restatement of theology at this late date must take place, in fact, in the light of comparative religion, in the light of that practical aspect of comparative religion, the study of which is richly provided by the foreign mission work of the Church. The restatement must, indeed, be as little of the West merely, as may be, and—here the assistance of the Foreign Field is invaluable now—as catholic as is possible at this stage. This, too, is seen to be necessary when one recalls how urgent upon our attention has become the oneness of the world, the nearness of its uttermost parts to one another. So that the Church's vital enterprises dare not be undertaken save in the missionary spirit with the missionary purpose. The fulfilment of such a purpose calls to-day for a living theology expressed in as universal terms as it is possible to achieve. And what I have called the neglected interpreter is here in God's wonderful providence with a wealth of assistance for the great task.

Finally, one other side of the subject must be touched upon which is in closest contact with the need of our time. It is this, that the practical study of comparative religion of which I have spoken and which is afforded in Foreign Mission study, reinforces superlatively the preaching and proclamation of Christianity as the absolute religion, and, one may add, gives added weight to the insistence, which is urgent to-day, upon the supreme claims of Christian morality, the Christian ethic. As has been truly written, 'The absolute religion can only be fully understood in the light of the imperfect religions, if religion is a practical matter at all, and theology other than a mere abstract science'; and it is also true, even alarmingly true in a time when the authority and sanction of the Christian ethic is in hot debate, that 'comparative religion is being used by many to-day in a negative interest with the view of proving that Christianity is only one among other religions.' These words were written ten years ago, and they can be underlined heavily to-day. These words represent facts with which a pulpit that is to charge itself with a living message and a powerful apologetic must reckon seriously. Here again, therefore, the neglected interpreter stands by to offer invaluable aid to the preaching and teaching of the Church. Again, too, there is here endless help towards the understanding of the New Testament account and teaching of the new life in Christ as it won its way through a non-Christian world; and the life of the first Churches, in their witness, in their failings, and in their difficulties, receives living illustration as you see it in reproduction here on the Foreign Field—the life, and the truth, and the way. Enough has been said to make good the claim for the study whose lines were indicated in the opening paragraph of this paper. The neglected interpreter obviously ought to remain neglected no longer, either as regards our study of the New Testament, or as regards our exposition of Christian doctrine, and our insistence upon the authority of the Lord Jesus in the Christian morality.

In what I have said there lies an appeal to the average minister. The man in the pulpit who mounts it with the merely congregational or little more than the parochial outlook is surely a tragedy in the Church as it faces 'the need of a world of men' to-day!

Entre Nous.

SOME TOPICS.

The Resurrection Narratives.

Is it possible to harmonize the Gospel narratives of Christ's resurrection? The Rev. N. P. Williams, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, does it in *The First Easter Morning* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). This is his way with one difficulty, the difference between Mark and Luke on the one hand, and Matthew on the other, regarding the visits of the women to the tomb. 'I think it will be found that—given *two* apparitions, which Matthew has,

mistakenly, though in perfect good faith "telescoped" into one—the whole scheme of events falls smoothly and instantaneously into an intelligible and natural order. Let us see how it works out.

'Suppose that the real order of events was as follows:—

'1. At midnight between Saturday and Sunday, the Roman guard is peacefully bivouacked before the tomb; they have been there since Friday evening, and nothing untoward has happened.

'2. Towards dawn, there is an earthquake, which dislodges the stone, accompanied by a supernatural manifestation of some kind, which the soldiers visualize as one or more terrible and superhuman figures; they are paralysed with terror for a few moments, and then fly in panic from the haunted spot.

'3. For about an hour, the (now open) tomb is deserted. Then, after sunrise, the women (half a dozen or so) arrive, bringing spices for the embalmment. They have not heard of the posting of the guard before the sepulchre, and therefore advance quite unsuspiciously, expecting no obstacle other than the actual stone. And, as the guard has fled in panic an hour ago, they are in fact able to approach the tomb without molestation.

'4. They perceive, to their amazement, that the stone has been already rolled away; they enter the tomb, and a *second* supernatural manifestation takes place, which they visualize as one, or two, white-robed figures: the Resurrection message is delivered.'

The Lost Ten Tribes.

Besides the Old Testament Apocrypha which we possess (but do not read) there are fragments in existence of a host of other apocrypha. Dr. M. R. James has gathered all these fragments together and translated them. He has published the translation, with his discussions, in the S.P.C.K. series of 'Translations of Early Documents.' The title is *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (5s. 6d. net).

It is a book for the curious. Among the rest, for that very curious person whose interest is in the Lost Ten Tribes. For 'the Ethiopic *Acts of St. Matthew* tell how Peter and Andrew met Matthew, and he told them that he had lately been in the land called Prokumenos, which being interpreted is "Those who rejoice," and had found the people Christian: in fact the Lord Himself constantly visited them. He asked them how this came about. Their answer was, "Hast thou not heard the story concerning the nine tribes and the half tribe whom God Almighty brought into the land of inheritance? We are they . . . As for gold and silver, we desire it not in our country: we eat not flesh and we drink not wine in our country, for our food is honey and our drink is the dew. We do not look upon the face of women with sinful desire: our firstborn children we offer as a gift to God, that they may minister in . . . the sanctuary . . . until they be thirty years of age. The water we drink floweth not from cisterns hewn by the hand of man but . . . floweth from Paradise. Our raiment is of the leaves of trees. No word of lying hear we in our land, and no man knoweth another who speaketh that which is false. No man taketh to wife two women in our land, and the son dieth not before his father, and the young man speaketh not in the presence of the aged. The lions dwell with us, but they do no harm to us nor we to them. When the winds rise we smell the scent of Paradise, and in our country there is neither spring nor cold nor ice, but there are winds, and they are always pleasant."'

The Making of a Revolutionary.

At a moment when the cleavage between organized capital and organized labour has become evident to us all, it is most necessary that those on either side should see the case as it presents itself to the other. Only by such steady vision can the cleavage be ended. The side of organized labour is put fairly and competently in a volume of essays, edited by Lucy Gardner, which, under the title of *Some Christian Essentials of Reconstruction*, has been published by Messrs. Bell & Sons (5s. net). Among the authors is the Rev. Basil Mathews, M.A., who says:

'When I was living at Mansfield House University Settlement, in Canning Town, as a resident worker, there came some particularly horrible weeks, which remain a permanent nightmare on the memory, during the famine winter. With others, it was part of my regular occupation at night during that winter to go through those streets of slush and snow into houses, investigating cases claiming relief. I could speak of a dozen or a

score of cases that I shall never forget. One particular case comes to my mind.

'I stumbled along a dark passage into a room where there was a man whose face was seamed and lined; his clothes hung loosely about his gaunt body, and as I looked round the room I saw there was nothing in it but a Tate cube sugar-box upside down, on which was some greasy paper containing the remains of some fried fish bought at the local fish shop, flanked by two little boxes. The one box was the table; the others were the chairs. The man told me how, through his absolute incapacity to get regular work, the little ornaments had gone from the mantelshelf, then the table and chairs, until the room was stripped. Then I asked about bedding, and relief of that kind, and he took me into another room where, on an absolutely bare bed, lay two boys in their day-clothes—they had no night-clothes and there were no bed-clothes. The boys were thin, white, stunted, wizened and undergrown; and the man, who had an evil-smelling lamp in his hand, shaded it so that the light should not fall on the boys' faces and awaken them. As he did so the light was reflected on his own face, and I saw the tears running down his cheeks.

'In that picture I saw, and see, the whole tragedy of unorganized labour in the context of our present industrial conditions. All that home meant, in the sense of having nice things around you, an ordered and beautiful life, and bringing up children with minds alert and happy—all these things were made impossible because the standard of wages and work was so low. And from that day to this I was made, and shall remain on to the end of my life, revolutionary in my social sympathies. The experience then revealed to me in its naked horror the degradation which comes from unorganized labour within an unsound economic system.'

The Philistines.

The Rev. T. H. Hennessy, M.A., formerly Dean and Lecturer of Selwyn College, Cambridge, has edited *Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Malachi* for the Cambridge little commentaries on the Revised Version (Cambridge: at the University Press; 3s. net). It looks as if it were an easy thing to do. Driver and the rest are all there to work upon. But just the wealth of good work makes the difficulty. Mr. Hennessy knows what has been done before him, and yet he is himself. This is his note on the Philistines (Ob 19): 'The LXX rendering "strangers" is thought to imply that the Philistines were immigrants, which is explicitly stated in Amos ix. 7. Caphtor, which is probably Crete, is named also in Deut. ii. 3 and Jer. xlvii. 4 as the original home of the Philistines. R. A. Stewart Macalister, in the Schweich Lectures of 1911, which were published under the title, *The Philistines*, has thrown new light on their history and civilization. He is inclined to believe that, as the inventors of the alphabet, the Philistines "laid the foundation stone of civilization" and in the "long and stubborn fight with the Philistines for the possession of the Promised Land" . . . "the Hebrews learned the lessons of culture which they needed for their own advancement." He doubts whether in the light of our new knowledge the colloquial use of Philistine for a boorish and bucolically-minded person is justified.'

An Intelligent Goodwill.

One of the uses of *The Christian World Pulpit*, of which the ninety-sixth volume has been published (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net), is to give us the opportunity of reading an occasional American sermon. There is no American thing that we are less familiar with, and it is a pity that it is so. For the American preacher seeks reality and ensues it with a great, sometimes a daring, determination.

In this volume there is a sermon by the Rev. Harry Foster Burns, Minister of First Parish Church, Dorchester, Mass. Its topic is Love. Mr. Burns finds that in the New Testament the word 'love' has two different meanings. 'It is sometimes used to signify personal affection: as when Jesus wept at the grave of Lazarus, and men said: "Behold how He loved him." At other times it is used to mean intelligent goodwill as: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten son," etc.'

This distinction Mr. Burns finds useful when he thinks of the commandment, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' It does not mean really love. 'One could not love his enemy in the sense of having a personal affection for him; but he can, and if he is like God he will, maintain toward him the attitude of intelligent goodwill.'

Some men will be thankful for the relief. But what about God? In that text which Mr. Burns has the courage to quote there is a little word 'so.' Where do you get it in when you translate: 'God had intelligent goodwill to the world that he gave his only begotten son'?

A Doctrine of the Atonement.

The Rev. E. L. Strong, M.A., Priest of the Oxford Mission Brotherhood of the Epiphany, Calcutta, has revised his *Lectures on the Incarnation of God*, and issued the book in a second edition (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). One of the critics of the first edition complained that 'the author "makes *God is love* his sole text; and yet benevolence is only one of the Divine attributes. Without His glory, awful majesty, and holiness, we get the theory that cessation from sin is all that is needed to reconcile God and man."' Mr. Strong's reply is that God is love and only love, for love includes all the attributes of God. Yet he believes in the wrath of God, believes in it so really that he considers it altogether a mistake to say that reconciliation has only one side.

In spite of the title, the central doctrine of the book is the Atonement. And this is Mr. Strong's doctrine of the Atonement.

'That there may be complete union of will between God and man, it is necessary that man should with all his heart desire communion with God, and hate with all his heart whatever prevents this communion. Till Christ came, the race of men, with a few exceptions, had wanted, not communion with God, but to go their own way; and the more they had done this the more they had sinned and the less they had cared or thought about communion with God. But Christ, bearing the sins of the world and realizing sin as that which prevented communion with God, and therefore hating it and suffering unspeakably because of it, *i.e.* longing for God more and more as communion with Him became more difficult, at last on the Cross arrived at the awful condition of realizing man's sin as that which had made communion with God altogether impossible. Then, instead of yielding in any degree to the temptation to be content with something else, and though He could not feel any of the joy which communion with God brings, yet He longed for Him with all the force of which His human nature was capable, and His heart broke because He could in no way and for no reason bear to be separated from His God. This means the most perfect loyalty to God that there could be, and it was man's loyalty. It was the perfect response to God made by man—*the* Man Christ Jesus, the head of our race, whose life is flowing to all parts of it; in and through whom therefore all men can at last make to God the perfect filial response of love as His true sons.'

RECENT POETRY.

Lauchlan MacLean Watt.

The Land of Memory (Hodder & Stoughton), by Dr. L. MacLean Watt, is something of an autobiography—an autobiography of early years with the Celtic imagination making a poetic atmosphere for it. The whole story is separated into scenes. In one scene the school is central, with the old and greatly loved schoolmaster passing, the pathos of his last silent years made deeper by the irresponsible fiddling of his successor. Then there is the widow who looks out across the moor every night for the son who returns at last a maniac. And there is the shepherd and his herd laddie who rescue the sheep from the snowstorm:

Hard through the heavy night their toil of love
They faced, until, within a sheltered dene,
They gathered into peace their precious care.
Then, 'Master, I am weary!' cried the lad,
And in the snow incontinent he fell,
That moment sealed in unawakening swoon.
His master, all outworn, yet right well knew
That through that sleep death's unreturning road
Led to the shadows. All his strength was gone;
So down beside the lad himself he laid
And took him in his arms, enfolding close
The unconscious servant, lest death's cold embrace
Supplanted his; and as the night grew keen,
Wrapt his own plaid about the faithful boy.
Then, soft as kisses, on his face the snow
Fell deep and silent. In the pallid dawn
The searchers, broken-hearted, found them thus,—
The servant breathing gently as a babe,
The master stark, a frozen bit of clay
His soul had grown too great for, in the mirk!

So men remember now, how sweet is love—
How, like the tender Shepherd of our souls,
It lifts even those the world wots nothing of,
To give their life for love's sake, for a friend.

R. Watson Kerr.

War Daubs (Lane; 3s. 6d. net) is not an ambitious title. The author is not ambitious. This can be 'thrown off,' but even this shows what he could an he would:

PRAYER.

I pray to God at night,
Tho' I know not where He is
Nor what He is;
Nor whether I am right:

I pray to God at night,
And it lifts me from myself;
I fear no more myself;
When I pray to God at night.

C. H. B. Kitchin.

The poems are few in C. H. B. Kitchin's *Curtains* (Blackwell; 1s. 6d. net), but they are poems. 'The Last Scene'—a dying man, the friends waiting, the doctor, the priest, and at the very end the Angels—it is almost too human and haunting. But this has the author's philosophy in it:

Ruler of infinite austerity
From whom, long listening through ecstatic hours
Men seek a spiritual mutilation
And guidance to the unperturbed serene,
Yours was the voice at which our grasping hands
Refrained from clutching at iniquity,
Still warm with flame that licks the roof of Hell.
But having will of us, you are transfigured
With an attractive aureole whose glare
Is colder than a mist around the moon;
Wherefore in wisdom meditate on this,
That when outworn incessantly with kneeling
On penitential stone, the flesh of man,
Delirious with fasting and sweet wounds
Self-loved and self-inflicted, cries for peace,
It is for you the spirit sings with joy
The chant ineffable of hidden spheres,
For you it finds delight voluptuous
In weakness through the curtains of the night,
—Not for the abstract law which you devise.

Eliot Crawshay-Williams.

O! for a God, omnipotent, supreme,
A live reality and not a dream!
A God to free this poor mad world of ours
Since Man himself lacks a deliverer's powers.

That is the note of all the poems in *Clouds and the Sun*, by Eliot Crawshay-Williams (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). Near the end he finds such a God:

That I have gazed upon the grace of God
Blazing and blossoming in a thousand ways,
In tiny flowers uplifted from the sod,
In the strong beauty of the circling days,
In leaping pulses of a heart alive
With hope and faith and high expectancy
Of things that fate and will shall yet contrive,
Deeds that shall live, though he that does shall die;
That I have thrilled with glories which reveal
To the deep understanding a supreme
And everlasting surety that can steel
The soul against all sorrow with a dream;
That I have had the eyes to see, the sense
To feel, I make my song of reverence.

John Macleod.

John Macleod fought on the Struma—waited and fought, and the waiting was as hard to his highland temper as the fighting. He is a true clansman. His loyalty is personal, for even his highland glens are individuals with qualities to love and suffer for. He has the fighting instinct, as they call it, but he hates war with a great fierce hatred—read the song of the Slimy God. And yet it is not all loss:

FULFILMENT.

Pictures lost when the painter dies
Fighting, that might have woven a spell
Of sun-splashed hills and towering skies,
For the battle-blinded shall glow to quell
Despair, and to gladden their eyeless eyes.

Music unwritten, that might have swayed
Crowds, had the war-god's dripping spear
Spared the maker, shall yet be played
In beauty, that shell-torn men, who hear
(Though others hear not), may die unafraid.[1]

[1] The title is *Macedonian Measures* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 3s. net).

Brookes More.

Mr. Brookes More calls his volume of sonnets *The Lover's Rosary* (Boston: Cornhill Company). Why? 'A chain of beads, used for counting prayers, may be called a "Rosary," but such a string, or chain, is more correctly named a "Chapter." A Chaplet is composed of fifty-nine beads; and when the devotee has told the fifty-nine beads three times, he has thereby completed a "Rosary." My dear reader, when you have the third time read this chain of sonnets, fifty-nine, you will have completed "The Lover's Rosary." And, as the beads are often made of precious jewels, let us hope some pearls may be found: alas, I fear many are fashioned of ashes.' That is his own answer.

The first thirty-one sonnets are called Pearls, the rest Ashes. Again, why? He does not answer our second question. And we cannot answer it ourselves, for the Ashes seem to be as precious as the Pearls. This is one of them:

When the soft tones of a great anthem roll
And quiver in the air—delicious pain—
Our morbid pulse beats with the sad refrain,
Giving a strange joy to the wakened soul:

And when we listen to the muffled toll
Of slow bells, warning us with solemn strain
What futile ends our labours may attain,
We look through dark death to a brighter goal.

Ah, why should discord lead to harmony,
Or why should sorrow sweetest joy entwine,
Or why should darkness lead us to the light?

Our reason staggers at the wrongs we see;—
Surely, our souls must quaff ethereal wine
To pluck eternal day — from an eternal night.

Egbert Sandford.

Mad Moments, by Egbert Sandford (Maunsel; 3s. net). The title is explained in the first poem:

They call him Madman — would frustrate his plan—
Ah! did they know that Madness makes the man.

And every poem is a moment's madness—what reviewers call a cameo—as this on Knocking:

Behold! we stand at the door
And knock.
Thou hast the key, Lord—
When wilt Thou unlock?

Our hearts are heavy—
Our heads are bowed—
Our souls have sorrow
And grief for shroud.

Behold! we stand at the door
And knock.
We would come in, Lord—
When wilt Thou unlock?

There is scarcely a poem in the book that is not as simple, surprising, and intelligible as the one just quoted.

Edward J. Thompson.

The story of the Lebanon horrors has been told in verse by Mr. Edward J. Thompson, M.C. It is a shuddering story. Mr. Thompson spares not:

For think—a man's a man and takes his chance;
A woman, at the worst,
Can sell her body, that she may be fed
(And since this world is cursed
With cads enow, that will not look askance
While that remains, her youth will bring her bread):
But helpless children, these that were so weak,
Some babes that could not speak,
That these should die in thousands, that a man
Might drink a slightly better brand of wine,
Or leave his worthless line
Another quarter-million pounds or so!
I tell you, I hope well,
Hope fiercely, that there is a real Hell,
No paltry pain of just some æons' span,
But lasting, where such brutes as these can go.

The title is *Vae Victis* (Epworth Press).

John S. Arkwright.

Messrs. Skeffington have sent out a second impression of *The Supreme Sacrifice, and Other Poems in Time of War*, by John S. Arkwright (7s. 6d. net). The volume is illustrated by Bruce

Bairnsfather, Wilmot Lunt, Louis Raemaekers, and L. Raven-Hill. The poem which gives the book its title is one of the few poems produced by the war which is likely to live. This verse will be quoted continually:

Proudly you gathered, rank on rank to war,
As who had heard God's message from afar;
All you had hoped for, all you had, you gave
To save Mankind — yourselves you scorned to save.

This also is memorable:

THE HAND OF GOD.

Some said that Faith had passed for evermore,
No vision now could lead a man to die—
And then, from sea to sea, from shore to shore,
Rang the loud challenge — rose the swift reply.

'Too hard,' they said, 'this pathway to be trod'—
'The goal too far for steps that faint and fail'—
And even as they spake the Hand of God
Moved down to touch the hesitating scale.

Now, if they say Man sinks into the beast,
With night for journey's end, and not the day,
False guides are these who knew his heart the least,
Tried in the furnace, tested in the fray.

Edith Anne Stewart.

Poems: Second Book, by Edith Anne Stewart (Swarthmore Press; 1s. 3d. net)—the title is short but it claims all that the word 'poem' means. And the word poem means a good deal. Let us hold to its distinctiveness and call verse verse. There is one poem, true and touching, on Mary of Bethany. There are others, if less touching not less true. There is this, for example:

ON THE MOUNT OF TRANSFIGURATION.

Here, far withdrawn, I stand
On the dim verge of space,
And seek my Fatherland,
And seek my Father's face.

These veils of finitude,
Worn thin as flying foam,
No longer now exclude
My eager eyes from home.

Home to Thy breast, my God,
To-night I fain would fly,
Not stricken to the sod,
Not dying bodily,

But passing, swift, unheard,
As Moses passed away
From Pisgah, like a bird
To nest, at close of day.

Vera Wheatley.

The title of Vera Wheatley's book is taken from Browning:

I send my heart up to thee, all my heart
In this my singing.

The title is *This, my Singing* (Macdonald; 5s. net). It is not much in bulk for the money, but there is poetry in it, and never can true poetry be put into the scales against pence. In one poem there is a direct challenge of T. E. B., even to the title:

SUNDAY IN MY GARDEN.

As I worked in my garden,
There was never a priest,
But I kept Sunday's law—
And the greatest was least.
For the first little primrose
That gleamed from the sod,
Was the King of the garden—
A sweet smile from God.

As I worked in my garden
The smell of the earth
Was the incense uprising
To praise life's new birth.

And the hymn in my garden
Was a bird's melody,
And each bud and leaflet
Showed Heaven to me.

There was no priestly discourse,
There was no spoken prayer,
As I worked in my garden—
But I know God was there.

Bertram Lloyd.

The one topic for the pulpit all this year, as part of the everlasting gospel, is peace. And that we may preach peace, let us understand and let us make the people understand, the black beastliness of war. Let us read the poems which Mr. Bertram Lloyd has collected into *The Paths of Glory* (Allen & Unwin). Some of them are realistic enough to serve the purpose, with a little over. But this one by Mr. Eliot Crawshay-Williams answers well a question that is sure to be asked:

Shall courage die
Because men take not from Time's hand
The ruthless scythe, and strew the land
With unripe harvest of humanity?
Must courage die
If it be not sustained with blood
And nurtured on the rare rich food
Of corpses battered in brutality?
Can courage die
While there is still a sea to roam,
Shouting destruction, spewing foam;
While there is yet the boundless air
To conquer; while man still may dare
The desert and the wilderness,
The lonely pinnacles that confess
No victor save the eagle; while
Woman and man must face the vile
Onslaught of sickness, and sustain
Infinite subtleties of pain;
While pangs of death and pangs of birth
Compass existence on this earth,
And every soul that's conscious knows
Hourly a strife with inward foes?
While all around us terrors lie,
Can courage die? Can courage die?
I'll not believe it; no, not I!

Kossovo.

Kossovo: Heroic Songs of the Serbs—that is the title. Kossovo is the valley in which the last great battle with the Turks was fought, the battle which gave Serbia to the Turkish heel for five centuries. It is the theme of the great series of Epic poems, and great they are and wonderful. They have been translated from the Serbian by Helen Rootham, and published in Oxford by Mr. Blackwell, most appropriately (4s. 6d. net). Maurice Baring writes an introduction. He says:

'The soul of these ballads is saturated with Christian faith, the faith of the crusaders, of the Morte d'Arthur, of Villon; the faith of the *gracieux galans* who stormed Jerusalem with young Lord Raymond. The "Ballad of the Fall of the Serbian Empire" gives us the key-note of all this song.

'A message comes from Jerusalem to the King:—

Say, dost thou desire a heav'nly kingdom,
Or dost thou prefer an earthly kingdom?
If thou should'st now choose an earthly kingdom,
Knights may girdle swords and saddle horses,
Tighten saddle-girths and ride to battle,—
You will fight the Turks and crush their army.
But if thou prefer a heav'nly kingdom,
Build thyself a church upon Kossovo,
Let not the foundations be of marble,
Let them be of samite and of scarlet, . . .
And to all thy warriors and their leaders,
Thou shalt give the sacraments and orders,
For thy army will most surely perish,
And thou, too, wilt perish with thine army.

'And the king chose the Heavenly Kingdom, built the Church, and went out to battle—and fell.'

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is now quite evident that we are on the eve of another great controversy. Throughout the whole length of the last generation controversy raged round the Old Testament. That it would pass into the New was inevitable. But the direction in which it would move was by no means clear. It has taken the most dangerous road that was open to it.

In the Old Testament the controversy was over dates and documents. The average man was interested, for he loves to watch 'a clean fight.' But he was not alarmed. And when it passed into the New Testament, and the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel or of the Epistle to the Ephesians was challenged, he was less disturbed than ever. He had come to see that these were not vital issues.

The controversy that is upon us has to do with the New Testament, but not with its dates or its documents. The first great controversy of all was over the Person of Christ. It must have been a thrilling time to live in. It takes no prophet to say that the next great controversy will be over the Person of Christ also, and that the rising generation will pass through an experience not less exciting.

What are the signs of its coming? They are many. But there is one sign of more significance than all the rest. It is that men of undeniable interest in Christ, men of theological training and Church loyalty, are seeking 'a way out of the Trinitarian difficulty.' They have various ways of seeking it. Some of them simply ignore the deity and write with a captivating beauty of language on the humanity of our Lord. Some are bolder and believe that they can discover a middle way.

Of the latter a good example is Mr. F. W. Westaway.

Mr. Westaway has written a book on *Science and Theology* (Blackie & Son; 15s. net). The book is as comprehensive as its title. More comprehensive. For it is an introduction to the study of Philosophy as well as of Science and Theology. It is, moreover, a remarkably well-informed introduction to all these disciplines. And its limpid clearness is an irresistible attraction. In the end of that book Mr. Westaway sets forth his conception of the Person of our Lord.

Mr. Westaway is not a Unitarian. There is the old Unitarianism of Channing, and there is the new Unitarianism of Martineau and Professor Jacks. But Mr. Westaway is not a Unitarian after either of these Unitarianisms. He sees, or

he believes that he sees, something in Christ that made Him—well, if not more than man, at any rate more than any other man—more than any man has been or is ever likely to be.

Is he a Trinitarian then? No, he is not a Trinitarian. He is not fond of the word. He is less fond of the thought. It is probably his dislike to the idea of 'three Persons in one God' that has sent him off. So he looks for a middle way and believes that he has found it.

At first there is nothing which Professor Jacks would not subscribe to. 'Though born of human parents, Jesus was endowed with a unique moral and spiritual personality, a spiritual personality of so high an order that His religious insight and moral goodness have had no equal in history. Unlike ordinary men, whose worldly outlook offers a persistent opposition to the influence of the Divine Spirit, Jesus represented the highest moral perfection of manhood, and in Him therefore the immanent God dwelt more fully and completely than in any other man. Just as His teaching was that of a prophet so His religious experience was that of a saint. He won His perfect holiness, as others have done in lesser degree, through the experience of moral weakness faced and overcome. A religious faith which finds in Him the supreme revelation of God is, therefore, fully justified.'

Professor Jacks, we say, would agree. But would he agree with this? 'The divinity of our Lord is no longer regarded as an historical fact proved by historical evidence, but as an hypothesis about the religious significance of the historical Person Jesus. We are convinced, though we cannot prove that the divine Logos dwelt in the historical Person Jesus, who thus became the Christ. The conviction seems to have its origin in our reflection upon the known facts, and it finds strong confirmation in the collective personal religious experience of the last 1900 years. Hence although Jesus was a man, the Christ is rightly worshipped as Divine.'

It looks at first as if this were the old severance between the Jesus of history and the Christ of worship—a severance made so much of ten years ago, and to so little purpose. But it is more than that. Mr. WESTAWAY accepts the Incarnation. He accepts it as a miracle. He says it is not a biological but a psychological miracle. But it is a miracle, 'even a stupendous miracle.' And then he says: 'The moral perfection of one Man was miraculously brought about by the indwelling Spirit of God.'

That last sentence is important. For the line that seems likely to be taken by those who deny the divinity of our Lord and yet refuse to be counted among the Unitarians is just that line. He was man and only man, but the Spirit of God was His in such a measure that He became—not more than man, they stop just short of that—but more than all other men. And so the question is: Will the man Jesus, because of the power of the Spirit resting on Him, be able to save to the uttermost?

Of all the volumes of essays edited by Canon STREETER the most disappointing was the last. The first volume, entitled *Foundations*, was certainly disturbing enough, for it seemed to leave no sure foundation whether for faith or for conduct. But disturbance was in the air and we accepted it. More difficult to receive was the volume on Prayer. To be told that Prayer is merely a pleasant emotion was a disappointment to the sinner, who still hoped that 'a bit of prayer' would do him good; it was absurdity to the saint, who knew by daily experience that God is a hearer and answerer. But the volume on the Spirit denied the very existence of the Holy Spirit and offered no compensation.

The volumes are understood to have had a considerable circulation. What influence have they had? Much more, it is probable, than they deserve to have. For it is very easy to forget that they are philosophical and not religious books.

With only a rare exception their writers' aim is not to interpret religious experience, but to bring experience to the test of reason. The value of religious experience is determined for them by its appeal to the intellect, and that intellect their own.

The result is failure. It is failure in every case. But it is most manifestly failure in the volume on the Spirit. For the doctrine of the Spirit is a doctrine of religious experience. It is not a doctrine of science or philosophy. The first and fullest record of its experience is in Scripture. But the Scripture record is first verified and then enlarged by the experience of modern life. Every sincere Christian has his own verification and enlargement. In the Christian community the doctrine of the Holy Spirit obtains its furthest reach and its fullest assurance.

The intellect is engaged with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It is engaged both with its verification and with its amplification. For the promise is that He shall lead us into all truth, and truth is unattainable without the co-operation of the intellect. But there is no surer path to failure than to make 'what is reasonable,' that is to say, the intellect alone, the sole test of truth.

That there are three Persons in the Godhead and yet but one God is not 'reasonable.' Even after you have defined the word Person as carefully as language can define it, you do not make it acceptable to the intellect alone. Professor PRINGLE-PATTISON, writing in this book, says accordingly that to speak of the work of the Holy Spirit is simply to speak of the work of God, who is a Spirit. And as a philosopher no other explanation is open to him, if even that is open. But his words are utterly futile to a Christian who has 'received the Holy Ghost since he believed.'

The difference between the philosopher and the follower of Christ is well seen in a small volume on *The Power of the Spirit* which has been written by the Rev. F. Stuart GARDINER, M.A., and has been published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark (3s.).

Mr. GARDINER gives full value to the place of the intellect. An outstanding merit of his book is its recognition of the reason as entitled to a voice in determining the value of the religious experience of the Holy Spirit. The chapter on the Distinctions in the Being of God is a chapter of philosophy. But the material on which the philosopher works is found in the Bible. Mr. GARDINER always begins there. And when he comes to the verification of the Scripture he appeals to a jury of more than one human faculty.

'God first manifested Himself as the Creator and source of all things, the father of men. Then He manifested Himself as the Redeeming Son, the Saviour. And, finally, He manifested Himself as the indwelling, regenerating, sanctifying Spirit, ever with us. "Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands or feet." And because there were these three modes of manifestation, it has been inferred that a ground for them must exist in the Being of God Himself, and that there is a threefoldness in God's essential nature. And this is made known to us in Scripture. In the Fourth Gospel, for instance, Christ asserts His pre-existence. "Before Abraham was, I am," "Glorify thou Me with the glory which I had with Thee, before the world was." John tells us, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God." The Word was the medium of God's Creation. "All things were made by Him." In the years of time, the Word became flesh, and tabernacled among men, and they beheld "the glory of the only-begotten of the Father."'

Thus does Mr. GARDINER go to the Bible for the source of his knowledge of the Holy Spirit. But at once he turns and asks what the intellect has to say to it. The intellect sees a distinction. There is God, and God with God. 'The office of the latter is utterance, forthgoing, action. Thus there is a duality in God. The unique nature and

mission of Christ are thus traced to something in the being of God. But Christ and the Holy Spirit are so related that both must be essentially within or essentially without the Godhead. God lives as the Father, God Original. He lives as God uttered, the Word. God going forth is related to God Original, as your word is to your mind. The third element is the unifying Spirit, the common life of the Father and the Eternal Word. If God creates, He will act as God going forth, and so all things come into being through the Word. If He enters into a race of created beings like ourselves in order to restore them to Himself, He will do so by His Spirit. Yet all such works of Word and Spirit are essentially works of God the Father, and neither of them work apart from Him, nor are even to be thought of as separate from Him. They are ever one with Him. This conception of the Trinity avoids separating God into parts. Neither the Son nor the Spirit is a section of the Godhead. No one of the three has attributes that the others do not possess. The Father is Eternal Love. The Son is Eternal Love. The Spirit is Eternal Love. Such a conception of the Trinity in Unity does not confound the Reason. It suggests a wealth of being in God, a social element in the nature of God, which is more congenial to our thinking than the cold, remote unity suggested by Deism.'

Then comes the verification in experience. 'This conception of the Trinity is confirmed by the spiritual experience of the Church, and by the manner in which it fits in with the Grand Economy of Redemption revealed in the gospel. Without such a threefoldness in God, the redemption of man would have been impossible. But when we conceive of there being such a distinction in the Being of God as has been suggested, we can at least dimly understand how the Eternal Father gave His Son for the redemption of the world, how the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, how He bore our sins in His own body on the Tree, and how the Holy Spirit of God goes forth to dwell in man, to regenerate him, to enable him to make his own redeeming work of the Saviour, so that it shall become effectual for him, and thus restore the broken fellowship between God and man. For God the Holy Spirit is God going forth to dwell in man, and make him once more a son of God.'

'Between the consistent religion of dogmatism and the consistent religion of liberty, between the marvellously perfect system of Rome and the entire freedom from system which calls itself Unitarianism, I see no choice.'

That was said by the Rev. Charles Hargrove when he began his ministry in Leeds. His biography (it includes an autobiography of the first half of his life) has been written by Dr. L. P. Jacks, Principal of Manchester College, Oxford, and Editor of *The Hibbert Journal*. It is the biography of one who was brought up in Plymouth Brethrenism, became (and remained for ten years) a Roman Catholic, and then ministered for a quarter of a century to a Unitarian congregation. Dr. Jacks calls the book *From Authority to Freedom* (Williams & Norgate; 12s. 6d. net).

It is to the title of the book that we wish to direct attention. For that title means that Dr. Jacks agrees with Mr. Hargrove. It means that Plymouth Brethrenism is reliance on the infallibility of the Bible, and Roman Catholicism is reliance on the infallibility of the Pope, and after those two infallibilities there is no possible position but Unitarianism. Is that so?

It is not so. There are those who reject every form of external infallibility as the guide of life and yet deny emphatically what Professor Jacks says, that 'henceforward' a man has 'to find his way as best he can, with none to guide him but his own conscience and the stars.'

When Robertson Smith was brought before his peers and charged with rejecting the infallible authority of Scripture he did not deny it. What

did he do? Did he fall back on the infallible authority of the Pope? It never even occurred to him. Did he then admit that he had no guide to God or the conduct of life but his own conscience and the stars? He did not. He invited his accusers to read the history of the Reformation. And he said that from the days of Melanchthon until now the true Protestant position was none of these three, but a fourth position, very much more reliable and enduring.

He could not believe in the absolute external authority of the Bible or the Pope, for he believed that the faculties which God had given him, and for the exercise of which he was to be held responsible, were to be used freely and fully. But just as little could he believe that he was left to the sole guidance of his conscience. For he had the unfaltering assurance that in every judgment he formed, and in every decision he made, he was under the direction of the Holy Spirit of God.

Professor JACKS says that a man is left to the guidance of his own conscience and the stars. What he means by 'the stars' it is not easy to say. But certainly he does not mean what Robertson SMITH meant when he spoke of the Holy Spirit. He cannot mean that. For to him there is no Holy Spirit. And it is just there that Mr. Hargrove and he make their mistake. They believe in God. They believe in the Spirit of God. They believe that God as a Spirit is immanent in the world. But they do not believe that the Holy Spirit is personally present at every act of Christ's faithful followers. To them such words as 'the Spirit of God maketh the reading but especially the preaching of the Word effectual' have no real meaning.

Professor JACKS is free to criticise the Old and New Testaments. So was Professor Robertson SMITH. But there is criticism and criticism. When Professor Robertson SMITH read in the Book of Acts, 'it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us,' he accepted the statement, for it was true to his own experience. When Professor JACKS reads it he has to turn 'the Holy Spirit' into 'the stars.'

Science and Theology have been making unmistakable approach to one another. Can they meet? The Rev. D. C. MACINTOSH, Ph.D., Dwight Professor of Theology in Yale University, makes them meet. He has written a book to prove that the old antagonism is at an end. He believes it to be at an end for everybody and for ever. He calls the book *Theology as an Empirical Science* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net).

Professor MACINTOSH brings Science and Theology together by demanding concessions from both. From Science he demands very little—simply the surrender of that blessed word Agnosticism. The scientific man who would become a theologian must believe in God. That is all. From Theology he demands much more.

He demands the surrender of all the facts and doctrines which gave Christianity its birth and in all the centuries have been its life. If you are to bring to an end this strife with men of science, he says to the follower of Christ, you must interpret Christ as He has never been interpreted before, except by those who are not His followers and do not desire to be.

You must surrender the Divinity of Christ. You will still be allowed to speak of it as if there were some reality in it. You will be allowed to speak of it in this way: 'It is when we interpret the personality and life of Jesus with special reference to his own experimental religion that we get what is perhaps the most fruitful view of his divine character. He was a man of deep personal religion; he had learned to depend upon God, and not in vain, for that reinforcement of the moral will which critical experimental religion finds to be the sort of "special providence" or "answer to prayer" which can be depended upon as the divine

response to the human religious adjustment. And in the light of what is empirically known of the value of moral experimental religion in general, the assertion is justified that the achievements of Jesus in the spiritual life and in his work for the world were decidedly enhanced through his dependence upon God for support and uplift in the life of the spirit. That is, more and more the divine power for the spiritual life became immanent within the life of Jesus, in response to his opening up of his life to God.'

You will be allowed much more in the same manner of speech—almost as much as you please. You will be allowed to say that there was a 'unique degree of divine quality in the character of this man,' though you will have to guard your meaning by adding that 'the divinity of Jesus was much more an achievement of his religious experience than a native endowment, however fortunate in his heredity he may have been.' But you will certainly not be allowed to say that 'the Word became flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.'

Is reconciliation with Science worth the price? That is not all the price that has to be paid for it.

You will have to give up the Atonement. You may still speak of an 'at-one-ment,' using hyphens and discarding the capital. You may speak of 'the atoning and saving work of the historic Jesus,' and of 'what has been and is being accomplished as a result of his self-sacrificing labours and the early death in which they culminated.' You may say that He saves, 'not simply by moral and religious teaching and example, but by revealing God.' You may even say that 'in the life and death of Jesus, then, in his activity and suffering, we see the divine—unselfishly loving man, working for his well-being, suffering in his affliction and burdened by his sin.' But in saying all that you must be warned that 'we have gone about as far as we can in the consideration of this topic without passing over from the realm of empirical data into that of theory.'

Perhaps that is not Atonement? Why should it be? If a man can save himself—if, for example, a soldier, whatever his belief or life, can save himself by his patriotism—where is the necessity for Atonement? 'The question is often raised whether some great, heroic act of self-sacrifice for the good of others, such as that of the soldier on the field of battle on behalf of a righteous cause, would not "atone for" the sins of the previous life. To this the answer ought now to be obvious. There is no atonement, in the sense of expiation, save repentance and its consequences, ceasing to do evil and learning to do well. The brave self-sacrificing act, however, *is* "doing well," and it means much for the character of the individual, and so for God's judgment of him. But as an act it means no more (except for later experiences of suffering and the like) that it led to his death, than if he had expected to give his life, but had "fortunately" escaped. And certainly not all who have expected to be killed in battle show by their later lives that they were truly reconciled to God.'

Is that all the price we have to pay? We have to give up the Resurrection. We have to give up all the miracles. The Resurrection goes the way of all the rest. For 'we shall find that the problem of evil is exceedingly difficult to solve, or indeed impossible of solution, if we admit the even occasional occurrences of miracles of this sort.' Of what sort? 'Arbitrary, exceptional, unmediated and therefore unpredictable "miracles"'—as if there were miracles of any other sort! We shall have to agree with Hegel that 'whether at the marriage at Cana the guests got a little more wine or a little less is a matter of absolutely no importance; nor is it any more essential to determine whether or not the man who had the withered hand was healed; for millions of men go about with withered and crippled limbs, whose limbs no man heals.' In short, we shall have to meet the man of science with his chemical objection to the turning of water

into wine, and say that, 'in view of recent events, any such miracle as that of Cana is *religiously* incredible.'

The Resurrection? It is just as incredible to Professor MACINTOSH as the spirit-rappings and table-turnings of the modern Spiritualist. They stand or fall together. 'The appearances and messages ascribed in the New Testament to the "risen Christ" are, psychologically speaking, essentially similar to those of modern spiritism and psychical research. Ecclesiastical tradition of long standing, and especially the great worth of the personality of Jesus and of the spiritual outlook associated with the "Resurrection," impart to this instance a dignity and impressiveness which even the most convincing modern instances of the phenomenon largely lack; but in the end both may be expected to stand or fall together.'

And, no doubt, if Jesus is the 'divine man' of the Dwight Professor, the difference is only one of degree—though even that, the degree being on his own showing so considerable, might have led him to leave the comparison alone. But if the Christ is not a degree better than a modern medium, but the only-begotten Son of God, come to dwell among us in order to bear the sin of the world and reconcile us to God, then we can understand that the miracles which He did were the natural acts of His Divine Person, and that even the Resurrection from the dead, with the subsequent appearances and messages, have nothing to do with the actions of 'discarnate spirits.'

Have we given up everything at last? No. We must give up God. For now it seems that in asking the man of Science to believe in God, we do not ask him to believe in the God made known to us by Jesus Christ. 'God is a spirit,' said Jesus. The man of Science has no intercourse with spirits. So Professor MACINTOSH provides God with a body.

He does not say that God is *not* a Spirit. He does not contradict one single fact upon which the Church of Christ is founded. He merely takes away the value of it. God is a spirit still, but the scientific observer is out with his telescope. He sweeps the heavens. He finds no trace of spirits. But he finds the heavens themselves? That is the body of God, says the accommodating theologian. That is the God you are invited to believe in.

Let us hear his words. 'Must we think of God as incorporeal? It would be absolutely unsatisfactory, of course—fatal, even, to the best type of experimental religion—to think of God in merely corporeal terms. But might not God be spiritual and also in a sense corporeal, somewhat as man, who is spiritual, is also in a sense corporeal? In other words, may not God *be* Spirit, and yet *have* a body? What this is meant to suggest is not the crude anthropomorphism of primitive forms of religious thought (or of present-day Mormonism), but rather the idea that the physical universe may perhaps be related to the divine Spirit somewhat as the human body is related to the human spirit.'

A Labour View of Christianity.

BY F. HERBERT STEAD, M.A., WARDEN OF THE ROBERT BROWNING SETTLEMENT, WALWORTH.

I AM asked to give a Labour view of Christianity. I shall best meet the wishes of my readers if I endeavour to put together what those who have the best right to speak in the name of the working classes of Great Britain have actually said on the subject.

The chief reservoir from which I draw is the series of volumes containing the proceedings at six

successive Labour Weeks, 1910 to 1915, held in Browning Hall, and the report of a Conference held in the same place in September 1919 on the Religion in the Labour Movement.

The speakers reported in these books are, it is true, none of them representative of the negative or unbelieving section of British Labour. But the fact that they comprise the most representative, the most trusted, and the most dynamic of British Labour leaders suggests that it is not to the purveyors of doubt to whom the working classes in this country most readily turn for leadership.

I. Of organized Christianity the general view is far from eulogistic. The author of *In Darkest Christendom* has endorsed, from his middle-class and purely religious standpoint, the criticisms long current in Labour circles of the Church as unfaithful to its divinely appointed duties. He finds the Church vocal concerning the lesser sins, but suspiciously silent concerning the root sin of the age, as he regards it—the exploitation of the weak by the strong, of the poor by the rich. He joins with Labour in lamenting the worship of wealth which prevails in the Church, and the sad extent to which it kowtows to the prevailing standards of mammonism, respectability, and snobbery. With the Labour men disappointment finds expression in terms less indignant but none the less severe. Alderman Banton of Leicester declares that the Churches have failed to interpret Christianity to the people, and holds that it is for the workers themselves to take up the duty which the Churches have failed to perform. Mr. John Hodge finds that the Churches have been blind in one eye. They could see the life beyond, but they ignored the life that now is. Christianity was a double-barrelled gun. The Churches had used only one barrel, caring for the individual soul but neglectful of social obligations. A humble taxi-driver declares that he 'could not see religion for the Church.' There is a general complaint of the unreality and insincerity of organized religion, of the respect paid to riches, and the scant respect paid to poverty. The tone of the Conference last September tended to suggest that the Churches as a whole were so bound up with middle-class limitations, prejudices, and mammon-worship as to show the need for Labour itself expressing in its own way its own deep religious life. The censure passed on the Churches was not, however, indiscriminate. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald says: 'The men and the women who are the sturdy warriors and magnificently reliable commissioned officers in our army are the men who go to church and chapel, the men who have got faith.' Most of the Labour leaders have been nurtured and developed in the Primitive, Wesleyan, Baptist, or other Nonconformist Churches. But at the same time one hears of a great Yorkshire city in which all the leaders in the Labour Movement were originally members of Nonconformist Churches, but had been fired out or frozen out because of their sympathies with Labour. It is a remarkable fact that since 1906, when the new democracy began to assert itself in the British Parliament, the statistics of the Wesleyan Church, which has been very largely a Church of the working classes, have steadily declined. It is true, Mr. Arthur Henderson grants, that a new social conscience is appearing among all the Churches. The religious bodies to-day are, he says, 'all beginning to feel that the great purpose of the Incarnation can never be fulfilled so long as we allow to remain unchallenged the sweater's den, the slum dwelling, the terrible extremes that we find in social life.' Mr. George Lansbury, as a devout Anglo-Catholic, is naturally less critical of the Church, does, in fact, appeal to the witness of the millions of men who have derived from the Unseen power to overcome the world, thus in effect invoking the testimony of the Church throughout the world to the dynamic effectiveness of religion. Pretty well all Labour critics of the Church grant that the Church has at any rate brought to their knowledge the ideal by which they condemn the Church.

II. The contrast is great when we turn from the Church to its Founder. One of the healthiest signs of the British Labour Movement, if not of the World Labour Movement, is the distinction that is drawn between Jesus and the organizations that bear His Name. Among the British working classes reverence for the Christ is even more widely spread than censure of His Church. More than twenty-five years ago, when I went round the commons and parks of London to hear the working men thinking aloud, I found that often a bitter hatred of the Church was combined with a touching devotion to Jesus Christ. 'I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and I don't believe in none o' your sects and denominations!' was the stentorian cry that evoked prolonged applause from a Victoria Park audience. In the same park a Jewish

denouncer of the God of the Bible was shouted down by an indignant crowd. An old friend of mine who had gone on a similar tour to my own a generation previous told me that then the speakers, with the huge applause of their audiences, indulged in the most ribald denunciations of the Christ and of all things sacred. The change may have many other causes. Perhaps the fact that the children of the people have in the public elementary schools been taught the facts of the life and character of Jesus has had something to do with the change. To-day, Mr. Jarman, of the Agricultural Labourers' Union, states that the labourers cheered his allusions to Jesus with more enthusiasm than they did the announcement of a 5s. a week rise in wages. Bishop Gore states that he understood that the Name of Jesus was never mentioned in a meeting of working men without evoking applause, and this statement was endorsed by the applause of his working-class hearers. The attitude of the British working men, whether Labour leader or of the rank and file, towards Jesus of Nazareth is essentially ethical and religious. He represents the character which ought to prevail. He embodies the purpose which all ought to pursue. It is a significant fact that twenty-five past and present members of the House of Commons have put their hands to this confession: 'Jesus said, If any man would come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me. Meaning so to follow Him, we desire to be enrolled in the Fellowship of Followers.' Several of the signatories may stand by the great creeds of Christendom, but it is more than questionable whether any creed would have been subscribed to by so wide and varied a group of Labour leaders.

Of what may be termed metaphysical Christology there is very little in the utterances of Labour. The Incarnation may be mentioned once or twice. It may be tacitly assumed. But working men generally are more interested in the fact that here in Jesus is the authoritative ideal of life, without exercising their minds too much about whence or how it came to be in Him. The working man seeks and finds in Jesus a working faith. The conative is more to him than the contemplative.

Of the Atonement, again, one finds very little attempt at an explicit statement. Keir Hardie forms the one conspicuous exception to this rule. He said: 'When once the human mind grasps the conception underlying the spiritual side of Christ's teaching, there is nothing in any religion anywhere which holds out the same appeal or exercises the same power over the mind and over the heart: for the idea is that man has been redeemed from sin, and that we have but to trust in the work done for us by Christ to attain that peace without which life is scarce worth having.' With other speakers there is frequent allusion to the fact that Christ died for us, that His apparent failure was the salvation of the world, that His sacrifice demands answering sacrifice from us. But only in the son of the Evangelical Union does the distinctively evangelic idea emerge into explicit statement.

III. The teaching of Jesus is warmly appreciated and strongly emphasized. There is very little reference to the prophets of Israel; there is less to the writings of St. Paul. It is the teaching of Jesus which is for the workers generally the essence of Christianity. The greatest stress is laid on His declaration and practice of the Brotherhood of Man. The Brotherhood of Man is often joined with the Fatherhood of God, but the impression is left that it is the Brotherhood which bulks larger in the mind of the workers than the Fatherhood. A Danish visitor attending the Labour Weeks reported that the two notes in the message of the Labour leaders were, personal following of Jesus and the Kingdom of God ON EARTH. The late Keir Hardie said: 'To the Socialist and Labour man in particular Christ's teaching should appeal with irresistible power. The modern preacher, misled by theologians, is apt to speak of the Kingdom of God as though it referred to the heaven that is to be in the world beyond. But the Kingdom in Christ's mind did not refer to a heaven in the future. The Kingdom of God meant the establishment right here upon the earth of a condition of things in which human life would be beautiful and would be free to develop along godlike lines.' Mr. Adamson, now leader of the Party in Parliament, insists on the law of love, love to God and love to man, as the supreme aim. Care for the widow, for the fatherless, for the crippled, blind, poor, aged, the least of these, is frequently enforced as enjoined by Jesus Christ. The Parable of the Good Samaritan has always been a favourite with the British workers and their leaders. Brotherly conduct to all, tenderness to little children, swift sympathy for all suffering, are also selected as expressions of the Christ's spirit. His denunciation of the rich, His call to sell all

and follow Him, are dear to the heart of the working man. Again, it is the practical, the working element in Christianity that appeals to the working man.

The idea of forgiveness is rarely referred to. It is taken for granted. It has been absorbed into the very blood of the English people. The conviction that when once a man means to do right his evil past will not be regarded by God as any hindrance to his new life is an axiom of the popular religion. Agonized supplication for pardon would seem to the converted working man as based on a very serious misunderstanding of the Divine character.

Similarly, guidance, another great gift of grace, is rarely referred to. It is rather the power infused by faith working through a man that is dwelt upon, than the guidance that shapes the outward lines of life.

The character and teaching of Jesus, these form the fascination of the spell which the Nazarene exercises on the workers of to-day. This appears even among those leaders of Continental Labour who describe themselves as agnostics. M. Longuet advises us to 'get back to Christ, the greatest revolutionary that history has known.' M. Vandervelde declares that the true follower of Jesus continues the Christian tradition across the centuries: 'For what was the primitive Christian religion if not a doctrine of revolution which had saved the world by suppressing slavery, and later the defender of liberty of conscience?' M. Vinck said that he aimed at acting as a Christian, but he could no longer believe as a Christian. He thought it better to act as a Christian than to 'believe in the anthropomorphic divinity of Christ and to act to the contrary of His teaching.' 'Christ has given us the best formula' for uniting all the upward workers in the Labour Movement. As Mr. G. H. Roberts says: 'We have got to bring the personality of Christ clearly back into the presence of our people.' It is noteworthy that after the convulsions of the war, the continental agnostics join up with a movement at the head of which stands the phalanx of twenty-five British Labour Members in the Fellowship of Followers of Jesus.

IV. The power of the Spirit of Jesus is often dwelt upon. Mr. Arthur Henderson refers to the revolution in character wrought in individual lives. Similarly the late Mr. Albert Stanley insisted that one individual conversion was to him a greater proof of the divinity of Christ's religion than all the historic arguments in the world. Mr. George Lansbury dwells on the inpouring of the divine strength which changes the lives of men like St. Augustine and Father Damien. Mr. Frank Goldstone finds in religion the driving force needed. Later, Mr. Lansbury insists that in religion alone is the staying power imparted to the social worker. Mr. G. H. Roberts says: 'We are standing on the threshold of stupendous development. Mental and spiritual power are going to exercise tremendous sway in the coming years. I believe that we are embarking on a Spiritual Age, which is certain to be as real as the Stone Age or the Iron Age of the past. Spiritual quality is the greatest need of modern development.' Here again we come on the instinct of the working man, with work to do, who finds his work cut out for him in the teaching of Jesus, and wants power laid on to the mechanism of his life, to enable him to do what is required of him,—still more to assist in shaping society anew in accordance with the same Divine requirements.

V. The life after death is not frequently referred to in these religious addresses of British Labour Leaders. This may be a natural recoil from the other-worldliness of the Churches. It is a reaction against which Mr. Arthur Henderson warns the workers. At the same time the living hope which is irrepressible and which lights up almost every utterance of religious Labour is not that of a personal immortality, but the hope of the Kingdom of God on earth, a transformed human society, a social order that is organized love. Personal immortality is certainly not denied. It too is taken for granted. But it evidently does not form the chief motive power of the conduct of Labour. To lay great stress upon it would be to encounter the suspicion of desiring to divert attention from the needed changes in this life to a personal Elysium beyond.

In the whole range of these speeches, not excluding those of the Latin agnostics, there is very little that is 'sicklied o'er with the pale cast' of doubt. The intellectual difficulties that have so often beset the middle-class seeker after truth are almost entirely ignored. Mr. Arthur Henderson boldly declares that no manner of doubt can avail against his living experience of the truth of Christ. No amount of ecclesiastical failure shakes in M. Vandervelde his belief that religion has a greater

future than it had a past. The Swiss Hans Wirz, speaking the language in which German criticism and German speculation have puzzled the world, calmly declares, as though doubt were non-existent, that it was the absence of the Spirit of Jesus that disabled the Social Democracy and the Christian Church from preventing the great world-war. Speakers again and again show that they are not unfamiliar with the negative suggestions of modern thought. They are not afraid to appeal to the witness of history, and especially of religious history, most of all to their own inward experience, as laying these spectres of the mind. With the characteristic virility of men accustomed to work, to doing things, they grasp the dynamic realities, and let all else pass with scant notice. Carlyle has said, 'No doubt will yield, except to action.' Here are men, working men, pre-eminently men of action, who have no room for doubt.

With all the shortcomings, dogmatic and ecclesiastic, which may be charged against the Christianity of British Labour, one has to admit that it lies much nearer to the central nerve of the original faith as it throbs in Jesus of Nazareth, than to the scholastic or middle-class or individualistic religion of the traditional Churches. 'Not he that nameth the Name, but he that doeth the Will,' is the cry of British Labour. And over against the religious selfishness and the cloudy speculation and the idolatry of comfort which have so long prevailed in our British Churches, one turns with joy to the open-air, breezy, healthy manliness of believing Labour. It has the old evangelic scorn of religious individualism. 'He that will save his own soul, the same shall lose it,' chimes exactly with the modern mood of Labour. Its very life lies in social solidarity.

British Labour has grasped the vital, practical essentials of the Kingdom of God. Just as the 'real historical school' of theological investigation has restored the Kingdom of God to its central place in the gospel of Jesus Christ, so have come to power the great masses of the workers of the world, thirsting with an insatiable craving for the social realization of the Kingdom of God, ripe and ready to acclaim, in the Central Figure of our faith, One who is pre-eminently their Jesus. It was this conviction that led to the late Keir Hardie's great utterance: 'If I were a thirty years younger man, I would methinks abandon house and home, and wife and child if need be, to go forth amongst the people to proclaim afresh and anew the full message of the gospel of Jesus of Nazareth. Brothers, preach anew the Kingdom of God upon earth, not something visionary away yonder in the clouds beyond the dawn, but something living here and now. Could we but inspire a sufficient number of men and women literally to give up the world that they might follow Christ, the world could yet be saved.'

Literature.

DAVID URQUHART.

One of the men whom Lord Lamington described in his book *In the Days of the Dandies* was David Urquhart. 'There were a great number of people,' he says, 'and those men of ability and consideration, who regarded Urquhart as a prophet—as the founder of a new dispensation. His was a strange career. He was Secretary at Constantinople during Lord Ponsonby's embassy; he then adopted quite the Oriental life, and his influence entirely superseded the ambassador's. This led to violent scenes, and Urquhart was recalled; this was in the reign of William IV., who became acquainted with Urquhart, and at once was subject to his influence. Had the King lived, that influence would have affected any Government. At this time, the *Portfolio*, a collection of documents on foreign affairs, was edited and written by Urquhart. It produced a great sensation in the diplomatic world, not only by the new light it threw on many political and social questions, but from the keen observations and ability of the writer. It contained from time to time passages of singular beauty and remarkable foresight.

'I remember when he foretold our terrible Afghanistan disasters of 1841, he wrote (I quote from memory): "I warn you in this midnight of your intoxication, a day-dawn of sorrow is at hand; and, although my voice is now raised in vain, and

my words find no responsive echo in your hearts, they will sink into your spirits when they are broken and subdued by misfortune."'

His chief work, *The Spirit of the East*, possesses great merit. He was entirely master of the Eastern question; and on his own evidence, like the poet, he wandered eastward, not now and then, but in his daily life. His house at Watford (Rickmansworth) was an Eastern palace, with a Turkish bath (for it was Mr. Urquhart who introduced Turkish baths into this country), which in luxuriousness was inferior to none in Constantinople.

He expended all the fortune he inherited, and the large sums he received from his many followers, on missions and couriers to all parts of the world. Through him the world was to be renewed. Never was a greater instance how faith in oneself can affect others. Although he has long passed away from public life, his memory survives among many who are interested in foreign affairs.

The Foreign Affairs Committees of Newcastle and many large towns still exist, and have not lost faith in the great master, with whom they were always 'in constant communication.'

A biography of Urquhart has at last been written. Its title is *David Urquhart: Some Chapters in the Life of a Victorian Knight-Errant of Justice and Liberty* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell; 25s. net). The author is Gertrude Robinson, who acknowledges assistance from members of the family, including Mr. F. F. Urquhart, Fellow of Balliol College, who writes an Introduction to the book.

To Lord Lamington's recollection much might be added. For the biographer has succeeded in making this man, so extraordinary in character and experience, an intelligible human being, and in doing so has recorded many episodes in his strange career. The strangest of all was the share he had in the passing of the Infallibility dogma at the Vatican Council. That a Protestant should be welcomed to the counsels of Pope and Cardinal is remarkable, but not more remarkable than that he should be so enthusiastically in favour of Papal infallibility. He had an almost uncanny gift of prescience and was able to anticipate some of our modern proposals. Immediately after the Franco-Prussian War he presented to the French Assembly his ideas for the establishment of 'The Tribunal for War.' The proposal was that the 'Assembly "would establish in such a manner as shall seem best a Tribunal without whose sanction no war shall be declared and no treaty ratified, the nature of which shall be rendered independent of all political interference and influence, by the manner and lasting nature of its appointment."'

THE APOCALYPSE.

While we look forward to the appearance of the Commentary on the Apocalypse which Dr. Charles has written for the 'International Critical' series, and which is almost ready for issue, we are glad to receive a truly great Introduction and Commentary by Isbon T. Beckwith, Ph.D., D.D., formerly Professor of the Interpretation of the New Testament in the General Theological Seminary, New York. It is a handsome volume of more than 800 pages, just one-half being occupied with the introduction. Its title is *The Apocalyse of John* (Macmillan; 21s. net).

Are we to understand from the title that Dr. Beckwith assigns the Apocalypse to John the Apostle? Yes, that is evidently its meaning. There is a very full discussion of the question of John's residence in Asia, which ends with the words: 'The balance of argument then leads to the conclusion that the Apostle's sojourn in Asia is probably a historic fact, and one that must be taken into account in estimating early external testimony to the authorship of the Revelation.' We then turn back to an earlier discussion of the authorship, where we read: 'In view then of the exceptional force of the external evidence, and the evidence, discussed at length below, in favor of John's activity in Asia at the end of the century, there appears a reasonable degree of probability in the tradition that the book comes from the Apostle.' That is a striking fact. For the movement at present is the other way. But Dr. Beckwith is a thorough scholar and of a sane judgment.

The theories as to the composition of the book are divided into three classes. First there is the *revision* theory, which postulates a *Grundschrift* or primary apocalypse, complete in itself, and afterwards edited and added to by other hands. This primary apocalypse is according to some critics Jewish, according to others Christian. Next there is the *compilation* theory: a number of Jewish and Christian documents were gathered together by a Christian redactor. And lastly there is the

incorporation theory. This theory 'views the Apocalypse as in reality a unit in so far as it possesses a definitely organized plan, conceived and carried out by a single writer; but in the execution of this plan the writer is held to have used in *certain places* eschatological material derived from other sources (whether Jewish, Christian, or oral tradition), which he worked over more or less and adapted to his purpose.' Dr. Beckwith is himself an advocate of the incorporation theory.

CHINESE TURKESTAN.

Miss Ella Sykes, F.R.G.S., and her brother, Brigadier-General Sir Percy Sykes, K.C.I.E., C.B., C.M.G., travelled together to Kashgar, the capital of Chinese Turkestan, in order that Sir Percy might undertake the duties of Consul-General and allow Sir George Macartney a furlough. The War had begun, and they had to make their way to Petrograd through Norway, Sweden, and Finland; and they were delayed by military movements throughout much of their journey through Russia; but once fairly into Turkestan they could not have told that there was a war on in the wide world. The story of the journey, of their stay in Kashgar, and of their subsequent visit to Khotan—which led them over the Russian Pamirs, called by the Persians Bam-i-Dunia, that is, 'Roof of the World,' is told by Miss Sykes. Sir Percy writes the last part of the book, which is chiefly geographical and historical. The title is *Through Deserts and Oases of Central Asia* (Macmillan; 21s. net).

Miss Sykes has the distinction of being the first woman to cross the dangerous passes which lead to and from the Pamirs. 'To be perfectly frank, I was by no means easy about this expedition, to which my brother looked forward with the eagerness of the sportsman. I have never had a good head for heights or for walking along the edge of precipices; and from the various books of travel that I had read it seemed that one ought to be possessed of unusual nerve and agility to negotiate the passes by which the Roof of the World must be reached. But I try to make it a rule to see only one lion in my path at a time, and not to waste strength and courage in picturing what may after all turn out to be imaginary dangers, and naturally my blood was stirred at the thought that I was about to start upon an adventure vouchsafed to very few women. The Pamirs had always been a name to conjure with, and evoked visions of high uplands, galloping Kirghiz, wild sheep with great curled horns, and an almost complete isolation from the world, and made me ashamed of my twinges of faint-heartedness, which, indeed, vanished for good and all when once we were on the road.'

This is the description of the crossing: 'When we had seen our baggage yaks loaded we walked up the narrow valley, down which ran a little stream with scanty grazing on its banks; but before long the stiff pull up the mountain side began, and we were obliged to mount. Our Kirghiz guide halted every few yards to let the panting horses take breath—in fact, the rarefied air on these heights seemed to try them almost as much as it would have exhausted us had we been forced to walk. We soon reached the snow-line, and our animals plunged and stumbled through freshly fallen snow on the narrow track where we moved along in single file. It seemed a long time, but in reality we reached the crest of the Katta Dawan in a couple of hours and found ourselves on a little plateau some 16,000 feet high. Clouds had been gathering during our climb and fine snow now began to fall fast, making us fear that we might be caught in a storm and possibly miss the track, which it needed the practised eye of the Kirghiz to discover. Fortunately the wind came to our rescue, sweeping the air clear at intervals, and I saw that we were in the midst of great white giants shouldering one another, a glacier lying to our left, shining in the fitful gleams of the sun. Ahead of us low green hills scantily flecked with snow opened out to give a glimpse of the intense blue of the Great Karakul Lake, a soft mist half revealing the landscape, and the whole making a picture of exquisite beauty that somewhat reminded us of the Highlands of Scotland. But it was no time to linger and enjoy the view, and we began the descent, soon dismounting as our horses floundered badly in the snow and I had no wish to be shot over Tommy's head. Then followed an hour of struggling downwards during which I was sometimes up to the knee in the snow, and once or twice fell headlong, my thick clothing impeding me a good deal but saving me from hurt in my tumbles. Somehow we scrambled down at last into a long defile, and the falling snow turned into a chilly sleet that cut our faces. But nothing of that sort mattered, and as we drank hot tea from

our thermos bottles I felt a glow of pride that not only was I the first Englishwoman to negotiate the Katta Dawan Pass, but that I was actually on that Roof of the World, which in my wildest day-dreams I had never imagined that I should visit.'

In Kashgar there is a Swedish Mission, and Sir Percy Skyes and his sister have much to say of the value of it. They had hardships to encounter, but they do not for a moment compare their enterprise and endurance with the selfless sacrifice made by the men and women of the Mission.

ELIZABETH CARY AGASSIZ.

Success in life, even in America, does not demand exceptional intellectual ability. Mrs. Agassiz was one of the most successful women in the world and won it by warmth of heart. She had ability certainly, but the point is that she used every ounce of it in the prosecution of her great scheme for the higher education of women, through her ever-victorious gift of sympathy. This is from her diary: 'Jan. 13, 1903: Went to dine at Bertram Hall. It was really charming—a pleasanter, more cheerful, better bred set of young girls I could not wish to see. The dinner was nice and very prettily served; the talk round the table was pleasant and intelligent. After dinner they showed me the game of ping-pong, after which I went around to see them in their rooms—pretty chambers and studies connected. It was all very satisfactory.'

Again: 'The story has often been told of Mrs. Agassiz that one year when the Commencement exercises were held in her own drawing-room, and there was only one candidate for a diploma, as she handed her the parchment adorned as usual with a rose thrust through the ribbon that bound it, she put both arms around the astonished girl's neck and exclaimed, "We're proud of you, my dear!" And in the same spirit years later in Sanders Theatre when she conferred the first degree of doctor of philosophy given by Radcliffe College, she increased its value many fold to the recipient by her whispered, "So glad you have it, dear."'

Mrs. Agassiz was the wife of Louis Agassiz, the famous Swiss scientist. She was wife, mother, secretary, and at last biographer to that remarkable but far from self-reliant man. When he died, and when she had his biography off her hands, she became interested in the education of American women, and with wonderful tact and the sheer weight of goodness, compelled the Harvard authorities to recognize Radcliffe College as a portion of the University.

She travelled a good deal — first with her husband, afterwards with intimate friends. Late in life she visited Oxford and Cambridge, and studied the methods of residential training in the women's colleges. Of Newnham she says: 'This short visit gave me of course but an outside glance, and the next day I spent the whole day there with my friends and travelling companions, Miss Felton and Miss Gray. We lunched with Mrs. Sidgwick and several of the resident ladies of the College. Here again, as at Girton, I felt that the presence of these ladies, their easy, sympathetic companionship with the students, must form no small part of the education which the girls receive at Newnham. Among these resident teachers is Miss Gladstone, daughter of the statesman, an exceptionally pleasant woman of much personal charm. Then there is Miss Clough, daughter (*sic*) of the poet, and Miss Fawcett who carried off the honours of the Mathematical Tripos one year from all competitors, and was, I believe, Senior Wrangler for that year, and there were several others whom I saw and knew less, but who were very pleasing. Miss Clough and Miss Fawcett were students at Newnham before they became resident teachers.'

The biographer, Lucy Allen Paton, has been happy in her work. The title is *Elizabeth Cary Agassiz* (Houghton, Mifflin; $3).

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Our disappointment with the official American attitude to the League of Nations is keen and justified, but we must not think that responsible opinion in the States is indifferent. Far from it. Here, for example, is a serious and valuable volume, written by sixteen of the foremost economists and scholars in the United States of America, and dealing solely with *The League of Nations: The Principle and the Practice* (Allen & Unwin; 15s. net). The volume is edited by Mr. Stephen Pierce Duggan, Director of the Institute of International Education.

Mr. Duggan gives this account of it: 'The book is intended to appeal to two classes of readers: intelligent laymen seeking a general exposition of the subject, and students in need of a textbook

on the subject. It is written in simple and untechnical language. Wherever technical terms have been employed, they have been clearly defined and consistently used. An attempt has been made to give a logical presentation of the subject. The book is divided into three parts. Part I. deals with the history, philosophy, and organization of a league of nations; Part II. with international co-operation as applied to concrete problems; Part III. with the place of the United States in a league of nations. For the benefit of the student or the reader who wishes to make a more detailed study of the subject, there have been placed in the appendix the plans of the Abbé Saint-Pierre and Immanuel Kant, the texts of the Holy Alliance and of the Monroe Doctrine which it called forth, the most important provisions of the Hague Conventions and the American reservations to the conventions, and the complete text of the Covenant as finally adopted at the Peace Conference. The book closes with a bibliography arranged according to chapters, which it is hoped will be particularly helpful in the further study of the subject and its specific problems.'

It is now time that preachers of the gospel should recognize that one of the great subjects of preaching is Peace. Throughout the whole country there ought to be delivered this year courses of lectures on that subject—with fair but firm exposition of the Christian attitude to war. To the furnishing of the preacher with reliable facts and suggestive ideas this book will be an unquestionable help.

BISHOP LEFROY.

The Right Rev. H. H. Montgomery, D.D., D.C.L., sometime Bishop of Tasmania, is the author of *The Life and Letters of George Alfred Lefroy, D.D., Bishop of Calcutta, and Metropolitan* (Longmans; 14s. net). The moment you open the book and see the strong, sincere, humorous face you decide that it is a book to read. There is clearly to be no compromise with evil, in himself or in others; but also there is to be no fanaticism. The biographer has left the Bishop to speak for himself. That was easy, for he was one of those enviable men who enjoy letter-writing, and he had those (as enviable?) relatives and friends who kept the letters every one. Dr. Montgomery had just to walk through them and make his choice.

The letters are full of India. And in spite of the work which had to be done, work which at last made him a helpless invalid, in spite also of the bitter disappointments that had to be suffered, you feel that the life of a bishop in India is an enjoyable life. For a long time after Lefroy went out he was occupied in preaching to the Muhammadans. It was not preaching. He had no sooner begun than he was interrupted and had to deal with the interruption. Sometimes it had to be a set debate—each speaker getting so much time to do his best with. And the results were never encouraging. But 'on his study table Lefroy kept a child's toy, a little painted wooden Humpty Dumpty. Sitting one side up he was grinning, and turned the other side up the corners of his mouth were down. When worried or tired he would glance at Humpty Dumpty, and if he found him looking doleful he would say, "Let us turn him up the other way and we shall get along better."' This is told of his Metropolitan years in Calcutta; it is true of Delhi and Lahore as well.

Then his sense of humour helped him. How good a gift it is when it comes from God! He writes to his mother in 1907 from Simla: 'Simla is having a woeful laugh at your son, on this wise. Last week there was a sale on behalf of the Y.W.C.A. I had to say something at the opening, and then to *do* something at the stalls. As you can imagine, the latter is difficult for me, especially at such an essentially feminine show. However, I secured a friend, a judge's wife, and said she must help me to spend a certain amount of money. At one stall she said to me, "How would you like that cushion?" a very pretty piece of hand-painting, fruit and flowers, on satin. I liked it; it was rather expensive, but I said I might as well buy one good thing and discharge my obligations at once as go pottering on with a lot of small things, so I got it. As we walked away from the stall a lady came up and whispered to my friend, "Will you tell me what the Bishop is going to do with that"—saché, I think they called it—anyhow, something for putting a lady's nightdress in! For such in truth it turned out to be, my friend asserting her own entire innocence. Anyhow, Simla has got a hold of it, and is having much sport. One of the Martin girls declares that a couple of days ago she heard two nursery-maids on the road which runs at the back of our house, and one was telling the other the story and speculating on what

I wanted it for. Having bought it as a cushion, I hold that it is such; I have given it to Mrs. Martin, and it figures on one of her couches in the drawing-room, and looks extremely pretty. I know you will pity me.'

There are some interesting references to Lord Kitchener. The strong man could give in to a stronger: 'I know you and mother will be interested to hear that Lord Kitchener has after all taken the action which I urged on him, but which at first he refused to do.' And then Kitchener's note: 'I shall always remember our many conversations and the kind and considerate way in which you have helped me to do something to improve the moral life of the men of the army.'

FREETHINKERS.

The word 'freethinker' is one of the most ill-used words in the English language. It is appropriated by those who count themselves atheists, as if there were no possibility of freedom of thought in theism. Mrs. Janet E. Courtney, O.B.E., who has written a book on *Freethinkers of the Nineteenth Century* (Chapman & Hall; 12s. 6d. net), rescues the word to its proper use. Her list of Freethinkers includes Maurice, of whom she says: 'Maurice would never have called himself a freethinker. He was no "freethinker," in the narrower sense of one who perforce questions Christian principles, an erroneous interpretation, which the word was never intended to convey. But that he was one of the great promoters of unfettered thinking, both within and without the Church, let the long line of his disciples bear convincing testimony.'

The essay on Maurice is the first and finest in the book. Mrs. Courtney's sympathy with himself is perfect, with his theology not very far short of perfection. And that is the more surprising that with Bradlaugh she has very great sympathy also. Bradlaugh, however, seems to have gained the right side of everybody who really knew him, his honesty and his chivalry captivating them.

The other freethinkers are Matthew Arnold, Huxley, Leslie Stephen, Harriet Martineau, and Charles Kingsley. Leslie Stephen never had a more appreciative biographer, and one is glad to see what wise appreciation can do for him. His own words were not always wise, nor was it altogether a virtue in him that he stood by them. The only woman is Harriet Martineau, and the only essay that seems to fall short is devoted to her. No doubt Mrs. Martineau, as she called herself, was difficult to live with, and no doubt she is difficult to sympathize with still. But every one of the seven had his waywardness.

One thing worth remarking comes to the surface. There is 'free-thought' still and of the atheistic variety, but it is far more restrained than it was in the nineteenth century. Even Huxley's tongue, not to speak of Bradlaugh's, would be considered vulgar and malicious to-day. Mrs. Courtney recognizes this. Matthew Arnold, she says, 'lived in a period of violent and outspoken atheism. Quite apart from vulgar tub-thumpers, such a brilliant and cultivated man of science as Professor Clifford could allow himself to call Christianity "that awful plague which has destroyed two civilisations," and could urge his hearers to show no tenderness to "the slender remnant of a system which has made its red mark on history and still lives to threaten mankind. Even the grotesque forms of its intellectual belief," he added, "have survived the discredit of its moral teaching." Such language is now out of fashion; even a Hyde Park orator would not find it a draw.'

There is an excellent portrait of each of the seven.

A MODERN INDIAN PHILOSOPHER.

A large octavo volume of philosophy in the familiar yellow jacket of the Publishing House of Macmillan, and with an author's name so Indian as S. Radhakrishnan, is sure to arouse considerable interest. Nor will the interest pass with the reading of it. There is no mistaking the difference between the Eastern mind and the Western. Every sentence has its peculiar flavour, every word has its special atmosphere. This means a certain demand on us for consideration, but it means also a strongly-felt and continued sense of enlargement. Professor Radhakrishnan makes an earnest appeal for the separation of philosophy from both religion and science. From science he has no difficulty in keeping it separate. But he cannot himself get rid of religion, not even for the stretch of a single page. And the two, philosophy and religion, are sometimes most curiously twisted together into one strand.

Professor Radhakrishnan is well furnished with knowledge and well dowered with intellectual ability to criticise it. He brings every one of the

modern systems under his survey. Every one of them he condemns. But it is the condemnation of an Eastern mind and must be appreciated from that point of view.

In the end Professor Radhakrishnan concludes that the sum and substance of all philosophy is still to be found in the Upanishads. 'The *Upanishads* present us with the elements of a philosophic system and thus try to satisfy a permanent want of human life. They give us the formulas by which we represent the nature of the one great Fact of Life, God. Perhaps they may not explain everything, but there is no question that later philosophy has only been a series of attempts to give a fuller form of expression to the suggestions of the *Upanishads*. We do not mean to say that the philosophy subsequent to the *Upanishads* made a conscious attempt to start with the Upanishadic ideal and develop it. What we urge is, the *Upanishads* being the earliest form of speculative idealism in the world, all that is good and great in subsequent philosophy looks like an unconscious commentary on the Upanishadic ideal, showing how free and expansive and how capable of accommodating within itself all forms of truth that ideal is.'

The title is *The Reign of Religion in Contemporary Philosophy* (12s. net).

S. TERESA.

The Benedictines of Stanbrook are engaged on a new translation from the Spanish into English of *The Letters of Saint Teresa*. The edition is to appear in four large octavo volumes of handsome appearance. And wherever necessary the letters are prefaced by explanatory Notes. This is to be carried through the whole series and will be a feature of it. The first volume is out (Baker; 9s. net). It is introduced by Cardinal Gasquet.

The letters of St. Teresa have long been 'known in various translations and editions, but any one,' says Cardinal Gasquet, 'who will take the trouble to compare the former translations with this present edition cannot fail to be struck with a great change for the better in the manner in which St. Teresa displays her wonderful personality. She appears to us, if one may use the expression, much more human and sympathetic.'

That is true. It is just the impression that the letters make on one. They are simple in style and describe the Saint's everyday doings. But they have one and all the impress of character. And occasionally one sees right into the soul of a greatly gifted, greatly tried, and greatly used woman.

In illustration of her trials, and as fair example of the letters and their translation, take this paragraph: 'The other novice who left us entered another convent. I was told for certain yesterday that she had gone out of her mind solely on account of having quitted us. How great are the judgments of God, Who defends the truth! Now people will realize what crazy things she said: for instance, that we tied the nuns hand and foot and flogged them—and would to God she had said nothing worse! She made a thousand other charges, bringing most serious accusations against us. I see clearly now that the Master wished us to suffer trials which would be to our advantage in the end.'

After suspension for a year or two on account of the War, *Ancient Egypt*, Professor Flinders Petrie's magnificent quarterly, has appeared again (2s.). And it has made some appearance. There are in the first part two articles by Somers Clarke, one by the Editor himself, and one by M. A. Murray, together with reviews of books and periodicals. But besides that there are three most beautiful full-page illustrations on plate paper and other illustrations in the text. For the money it is a marvel.

'Words, words, words,' says the Prime Minister. Yes, but it is wonderful what one can do with words. What but words is all that book which Mr. Charles Inge has written, calling it *Flashes of London* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net)? And yet London is seen in it—the Rush and Roar of London, the Lights of London, the Failures, the Ladies of Prey, the Sisters of Fear, and all the rest. Every chapter is a complete picture; together they make a gallery; and you can carry the whole gallery in your pocket. It used to be counted a wonderful thing for one to know the London streets; what is that to knowing the London people? And Mr. Charles Inge knows them.

The seventh volume of the *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* is the complete issue for 1920 (Baptist Union Publication Department; 7s. 6d. net). It contains 128 pages of printing, and every one of its seven articles is a study that

has demanded time and patience as well as the historical judgment. The 'Conscientious Objector of 1575' seems a little out of date, but in the hands of Dr. Albert Peel he proves to be a person of interest as well as of importance. The leading place is taken by an unsigned article on 'Dissent in Worcestershire during the Seventeenth Century.'

Mr. Blackwell of Oxford has published a volume —most interesting, most instructive—on *The Trees, Shrubs, and Plants of Virgil* (6s. net). It has been written by Mr. John Sargeaunt, late Master at Westminster.

Mr. Blackwell has entered upon the publication of a new series of reprints of famous old writings. 'The Percy Reprints' they are to be called. The first number is *The Unfortunate Traveller* of Thomas Nashe. The editor is H. F. B. Brett-Smith, who writes sympathetically to the whole idea and to Thomas Nashe, and says all that has to be said by way of introduction. But the most enticing sentences are those quoted by the publishers on the jacket. They are quoted from Sir Walter Raleigh's book on *The English Novel.* This is the quotation: 'The strongest and best of his writing . . . merits this high praise—it is likest of all others to Shakespeare's prose writing. The same irrepressible inexhaustible wit, the same overpowering and often careless wealth of vocabulary, the same delight in humorous aberrations of logic distinguish both writers. And Shakespeare alone of his sixteenth-century contemporaries can surpass Nash in the double command of the springs of terror and of humour.'

The volume is an exact and highly attractive reprint, with the 1594 title-page and all complete.

A careful and prudent investigation into the problem of War has been made by the Rev. J. E. W. Wallis, M.A., Vicar of Whalley. The title is *The Sword of Justice*, with the alternative: 'Or the Christian Philosophy of War completed in the Idea of a League of Nations.' The publisher is Mr. Blackwell (5s. net).

The accomplishment of the book has been stated in the Introduction, which is written by Mr. Ernest Barker, Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. 'Mr. Wallis has explored in this little volume a field of perennial interest, and never more interesting than to-day. He has asked and sought to answer a question which in the last five years has troubled many tender consciences—whether Christians may ever avail themselves of force. He has investigated and brought to light the conceptions which Christians have held through the centuries about the conditions which make war "just," and the grounds that entitle war to be lifted to the dignity of a "Crusade," and termed by the name of "Holy War." He has sought to show what the Church has done in the past to restrain war, and he has suggested what she may do in the future to help the success of a League of Nations.'

This is Mr. Wallis's position: '1. The state must be ready to employ force as the sanction and guarantee of its legislation. No law would be long regarded to the infringement of which no punishment was attached.

'2. The state must be ready to employ force for the preservation of order. It must protect the life and the property of its citizens from thieves, burglars, and brigands.

'3. The state must be ready to employ force for the execution of justice—that is to say, to carry out the punishment of recalcitrant offenders by fines, imprisonment, or other penalty.

'4. The state must be ready to employ force for self-protection against internal and external foes.'

Mr. Alfred Morris Perry has made a study of *The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative*, and has had his results published at the University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: at the University Press; $0.75 net). The book is one that might well excite the envy of the professors and students in British Universities. To be sure that one's original and painstaking work will be published is an encouragement to persevere with it. And it is a gain to knowledge. It is a small part of the great ocean of truth that Mr. Perry sails over, but he explores it thoroughly, and we know it after him.

At the Cambridge University Press there is published an expurgated edition of Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria* (10s. net). The expurgation has been done by Mr. George Sampson. It consists of the excision of chapters v.–xiii.; and unlike some expurgations it is a distinct gain to the book. It is also a relief to the reader. For now he can read the Biographia straight on without 'the mass

of imported metaphysic that Coleridge proudly dumped into the middle.' Mr. Sampson has added Notes—after the manner of the most highly approved school and college editions.

Besides the Biographia Literaria the volume contains Wordsworth's Prefaces and Essays on Poetry from 1800 to 1815.

But (Coleridgian worshippers forgive!) there is nothing in the book that has given us a shred of the enjoyment we have found in Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's introductory essay. What a gift is the gift of style! To say a thing—to say that Dorothy Wordsworth loved and could have saved Coleridge—and to say it so that one's being is moved!

The Books of Haggai and Zechariah have now appeared in the small Cambridge edition of the Revised Version. The editor is the Rev. T. W. Crafer, D.D. (3s. net). Zechariah is divided into two parts. Zechariah's 'own work ends before ch. ix. as certainly as does Isaiah's before ch. xl. of his book.' Who is the author of Zech. ix.–xiv.? Dr. Crafer does not know. But 'we cannot follow Dr. Barnes in making the author an actual "disciple" of Zechariah. Indeed, the new apocalyptic element marks quite a different line of thought. The prophecy does not seem to be later than the arrival of Nehemiah in Jerusalem in 444, and the book of Malachi, which probably dates from about the same time. How much earlier it was spoken, it is impossible to say. It must be remembered that it is quite likely that Ezra's coming from Babylon and his work at Jerusalem was *after* that of Nehemiah. We know nothing whatever of the history of the Jews and their capital during the earlier half of the fifth century. If we may connect these chapters with this obscure period, it adds to their interest and importance.'

Dr. S. J. Case, Professor of Early Church History and New Testament Interpretation in the University of Chicago, has published a commentary on *The Revelation of John* (Cambridge: at the University Press; $2 net). It is not a word-for-word commentary. Professor Case is interested in the language of the Apocalypse, but he is more interested in its thought. He himself calls it an historical interpretation. After a long introduction describing the local and temporal environment, there come the Letters to the Seven Churches, each letter being translated familiarly and then interpreted as a whole. That plan is worked out to the end.

The interpretation is historical, as the title tells us, and as we should have expected it to be. For 'the historical method alone does justice to John and his Asian contemporaries. It is able to hear him speak the language of his time and to perceive his meaning as understood by the people of that day. It recognizes that he meant what he said when he predicted the early destruction of the Roman Empire, and it readily understands the impelling motives which prompted him to utter such a prophecy. Similarly appropriate to his situation are his predictions of a catastrophic end of the world and his expectation of Christ's early return after only two more emperors had ruled. These realistic phases of John's thinking can be appreciated only by one who employs the historical method, learning to read John's language in the light of hopes and experiences peculiar to that age. His apocalyptic imagery can then be given the meaning that it had in ancient times as illustrated in the typical apocalyptic writings of the period. With this method in hand the long-misunderstood mysteries of Revelation are easily solved.'

At the Chiswick Press, Mr. S. M. Gregory has published a volume of essays dealing chiefly with Armenia and the Armenians, and has called it *The Land of Ararat* (7s. 6d. net). The first essay is an effort to locate the Garden of Eden, and not an amateur's effort. For Mr. Gregory is a scholar, as well as a traveller and wary observer. He gives good reasons for his belief that Paradise was in Armenia—at least as good as any one else has ever given for any other locality. There is another essay on the Deluge—not quite so convincing, but worth the attention of the expert.

But most of the book is occupied with the Armenians. It contains a chronological history of the country and a full description of the Armenian Church Calendar. Altogether it is a notable book on a wonderful people.

Much was at one time heard about Animism. The word occurs frequently throughout the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics. Count Goblet D'Alviella, who writes the article in that work, shows that the word is used by anthropologists in more ways than one. There is one way, however, in which its use is most significant. It is

to name that belief which attributes personal life to trees and plants and even to such material things as precious stones.

That personality was once even in civilized society actually attributed to precious stones is proved by Zunz in his book *The Curious Lore of Precious Stones*. He quotes from Francisci Ruci of the sixteenth century: 'It has recently been related to me by a lady worthy of credence, that a noble-woman, descended from the illustrious house of Luxemburg, had in her possession two diamonds which she had inherited, and which produced others in such miraculous wise, that whoever examined them at stated intervals judged that they had engendered progeny like themselves. The cause of this (if it be permissible to philosophize regarding such a strange matter) would seem to be that the celestial energy in the parent stones, qualified by someone as "*vis adamantifica*" first changes the surrounding air into water, or some similar substance, and then condenses and hardens this into the diamond gem.'

The quotation is repeated by Dr. Frederick Schleiter in his book on *Religion and Culture* (Oxford University Press; 8s. 6d. net). Dr. Schleiter's purpose is to show that religious beliefs belong to their own 'cultural area.' You must not say that such and such a superstition is a superstition, without adding to whom and where. There is no science in Sir J. G. Frazer's way of gathering innumerable examples of a belief or superstition and then drawing conclusions from them; each example is isolated and the twisting of them together will only make a rope of sand.

Such an isolated belief is Animism. There may be individuals or even tribes which attribute personality to sticks and stones; but they are not many, and you cannot generalize from them. You cannot generalize enough to give your generalization the dignity of such a name as Animism. For the most part it is only an imaginative make-believe. The child hugs the doll as if it were a living babe, but she knows quite well that it is only 'a bag of sawdust.' And the savage is just a child.

Professor T. B. Kilpatrick, D.D., of Toronto, is the author of *The Redemption of Man*, one of the volumes of 'The Short Course Series' (T. & T. Clark; 3s.). Dr. Kilpatrick is as accomplished a theologian as the Presbyterian Church can produce, and what Church can produce a higher accomplishment? To his natural ability and severe training he has added an exacting experience. In this volume he expounds popularly the great doctrines of Redemption, and every word is carefully considered, every statement is severely true to Scripture and experience.

Professor A. T. Robertson is one of the most industrious religious writers of the day. His New Testament Greek Grammar is a marvellous accomplishment, had he done nothing else in his lifetime. But he has done more things than can easily be numbered. The latest of his works is a volume in Messrs. Duckworth's 'Studies in Theology' on *The Pharisees and Jesus* (5s. net). The industry is seen best at the end. The list of books in the bibliography contains 360 items. The Index of Subjects and the Index of Texts are both exhaustive.

Dr. Robertson has not whitewashed the Pharisees. That has perhaps been done sufficiently now. He finds the Pharisees whom our Lord had to do with quite unlovable persons, and enumerates no fewer than seven serious sins that they were guilty of. The sins were spiritual blindness, formalism, prejudice, traditionalism, hypocrisy, blasphemy, and the rejection of God.

It was an expected subject for a course of lectures, but Dr. Robertson has shown that it can be made both convincing and converting.

The Rev. Harold C. Morton, B.A., has gathered together and presented in clear consecutive form the main teachings of Wesley and his helpers. The title is *Messages that Made the Revival* (Epworth Press; 2s. net).

Professor W. F. Lofthouse has edited a volume of essays on *The Christian Use of Money* (Epworth Press; 3s. net). Could you suggest a more urgent topic? They say that what the Apostle wrote about it was not '*the* root of all evil,' but '*a* root.' If he had written to-day he might have written as he has been translated. For every sin and every crime seems to run back to it. Drunkenness? Yes—on the part of the drink-seller. Prostitution? —Yes, on the part of the sweater. And so on, and so on. This book is at once an arrest and an enlightenment. The men are in earnest though not in despair. Let their effort bear its fruit in discourses—a most profitable series it might be.

We do not know that Catholics should read the *Life of the Ven. Anne Madeleine Remuzat* (Gill; 6s.), but Protestants should certainly do so. For it rests on a conception of life that is both strange and bewildering. While Madeleine Remuzat, whose father was a prosperous merchant in Marseilles, was still a child she determined to become a nun. A nun she became, entering the nunnery at the age of eight. Soon after she came to believe that she was called upon to be a 'victim.' That is the very word. 'One day whilst Madeleine was in the enjoyment of one of those feasts of love with which her Saviour nourished her soul, He appeared to her, and said in accents of ineffable tenderness: "My child, I seek a victim."' And a victim she became. For years she suffered tortures of body and agonies of mind which are all faithfully described in her life, until at last the end came when she had just passed her thirty-third year. The torture was mental—the idea that she was a doubter and a castaway, but it soon became physical also. And lest the headaches and the consumption should not be enough, she 'added the sharp edge of bodily austerities, such as disciplines, chains, and hairshirt.' Then she had visions. How could she help it? But the wonder is that the Sisters of the Visitation of Harrow should think that they ought to translate the book and make public her and their conception of Christ.

Messrs. Heffer & Sons of Cambridge have published three captivating little books, two of them liturgical, the third anthological. One of the liturgical, *The Sung Eucharist*, is 'A Commentary on the Solemn Celebration of the Holy Mysteries,' by the Rev. John C. H. How, M.A., Precentor of Trinity College (2s. net). It contains also the Music of the Eucharist after the setting of Merbecke. The other is *A Little Guide to Eucharistic Worship*, by B. T. D. Smith, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Sidney Sussex College (1s. net). The drawings and decorations in it are by H. C. Hughes, M.A., Assistant in the University School of Architecture. *The Unclouded Vision* (2s. net) is a gathering of 'Thoughts for the Pure in Heart,' by M. C. Jenkinson.

The Rev. Edward Shillito has written much (though not yet so much as his chief, Dr. Horton) both in poetry and in prose, and his best book is his latest. If he never writes a better he need not wonder or lament. Its title is *The Return to God* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). The whole philosophy of Redemption is in the title and in the book. And it is offered in modern beautiful, almost seductive, language, with a great strong faith urging on the hand to do its possible best.

Those who wish to know what the Church of Scotland is doing to encourage the ministry of Women should read *Alice Maxwell, Deaconess*, a short and simple biography, written by her sister Mrs. Horatio Macrae (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). There are no adventures or stirring events. From first to last it is a record of quiet, courteous, unassuming, but most effective service. And always it is 'Who loved me'—Christ first, me last, nothing between but love.

The unspeakable Turk was never seen in his unspeakableness more glaringly—no, not even in Morgentau's account of his treatment of our Kut prisoners—than in *The Memoirs of Naim Bey*, a small collection of Turkish Official Documents relating to the Deportations and Massacres of Armenians, compiled by Aram Andonian, and published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (2s. net). 'For cold and bestial cruelty,' says Viscount Gladstone, who introduces the book, 'the names of Enver and Talaat are consigned to undying infamy.' Take this single dispatch from Talaat to the Turkish governor of Aleppo: 'Sept. 16, 1915. It was at first communicated to you that the Government, by order of the Jemiet (the Ittihad Committee) had decided to destroy completely all the Armenians living in Turkey. Those who oppose this order and decision cannot remain on the official staff of the Empire. An end must be put to their existence, however criminal the measures taken may be, and no regard must be paid to either age or sex nor to conscientious scruples.

'Minister of the Interior,
TALAAT.'

By the time a man is over eighty years of age he ought to have learned a little wisdom. Mr. J. F. Fuller, who writes *Omniana, the Autobiography of an Irish Octogenarian* (Jarrolds; 12s. 6d. net), claims common sense, and he may possess it. But common sense and wisdom are (as Cowper has it) 'far from being one.' The man of common sense

rules his life by worldly proverbs; the man of wisdom laughs at worldly proverbs and worldly prudence and ventures forth into the unknown and eternal. When Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees, his neighbours said, 'A rolling stone gathers no moss.' When Moses gave up his situation under Jethro to redeem Israel, the rest of the shepherds warned him that 'A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.' Mr. Fuller has been actor, author, and architect; he has built churches and he has made money. But he does not possess a copy of the Bible, looks forward with complacency to the extinction of his existence, and has never seen any beauty in the Lord Jesus Christ that he should desire Him.

His book is crowded with comments on the men and women whom he has met. And it has to be said for him that if he does not spare them—dead or alive—neither does he spare himself. He has no vanity. The long story of the ten-pound note which he lost at a certain racecourse is told with ridiculous simplicity. Yet he is not altogether without humour, though it is of the rough and ready kind. Towards the end of the book there are long discourses of many things—eating, drinking, smoking, the wearing of 'top' hats, and much else. If you care you can add this to your collection of Children's Sayings: 'Melesina Trench, in a letter to Mary Leadbeater the authoress, tells a story of her "second little boy," and how, when she admonished him, after an angry bout with a play-mate, remarking that "we should meet all our friends in heaven," got for answer, "with the most *satisfied* expression (the italics are hers) and the countenance which painters give to a seraph, 'Oh! no! for some of our friends will be in Hell!'" This was in 1813; and the son was Richard Chenevix Trench, then six years old—the future High Church Archbishop of Dublin; a delightful fact to which he does not refer in her *Remains*, edited by him.'

The Liberal Year Book for 1920 is out (Liberal Publication Department; 1s. 6d. net). It has a liberal allowance of useful knowledge, whether the reader is a Liberal or not. There is an excellent short account of what has to be paid in Income Tax; there are lists of books of special interest to politicians, and there are arguments wherewith to demolish the Coalition Government. The biographies of Members of Parliament give their addresses and much other information.

'Providence has been kind to me. It has been my sacred and cherished privilege to have gone through a long hard training time of intellectual toil, of discipline and of self-sacrifice. That has helped me to think more clearly and more dispassionately. Much more than this, it has enabled me to do my work from a higher motive than that of ambition. My motive has been to try to bring to minds groping in mist or gloom the light which has dawned upon me during years of deep thought and enthusiastic teaching, so as to put before them, plainly, as I hope, and earnestly, as I know, the fact that after all there is really something worth living for and worth dying for, something towards which, often unconsciously, sometimes unwillingly but always inevitably, men strive.'

With those courageous and encouraging words the Rev. Robert Kane, S.J., sends out his book on *Worth* (Longmans; 6s. 6d. net). He finds worth everywhere throughout God's universe and the life of man, except where it is nullified by sinfulness. He is an old man and blind, he tells us, but he has lost none of the belief in God and man which he held in his lusty prime. His faith has grown in strength and in tolerance. He finds good in everything (always with the one shadow, which also he knows how to dispel). Even in imagination and even in fancy he discerns blessing, and he can distinguish between them.

'Fancy and imagination may appear to be quite the same faculty, or at least their attributes may seem to be almost identical. That depends on the use one makes of the words. The words are often used as synonyms; but even as synonyms they have not absolutely the same sense. Our meaning of the words will be rooted in their derivation, and their derivation is rooted in fact. The word imagination is originally derived from the Latin word meaning "an image." The word fancy is originally derived from the Greek word meaning "an appearance." Between these two there is distinctiveness enough to found a difference. The image is the representation of a thing; the appearance is the coming of the thing itself. In other words the imagination shows a sign *from which* the thing is known; the fancy shows a sign *in which* the thing is known. From this we may infer that the function of imagination is to

bring the absent or the unseen, the abstract or the ideal, as real and present before the mind; while the function of fancy is to clothe the thing in such vivid and full appearances as to make it come itself lifelike before the thought.'

How young men should read the Gospels is shown by Mr. John M. Holmes in *Jesus and the Young Man of To-day* (Macmillan; $1). If young men *will* not read the Gospels, let them read this book. It is not so interesting as the Gospels, it is not so strengthening; but it is modern, explicit, and educative—truly literary and truly religious.

Under the title of *Freedom and Advance* (Macmillan; 9s. net), the Rev. Oscar L. Joseph has published a volume of essays in religion. Most of the great religious matters are discussed in it—Authority, the Bible, the Person of Christ, the Work of Christ, Experience, the Ministry, Worship, Education, Social Christianity, Comparative Religion, the Spread of the Gospel, and the Hereafter—and all competently. But the author has an object. It is to show that we are advancing in religion, that we are making progress in our attitude to the Bible, in our conception of Christ, in our acceptance of Comparative Religion. He addresses the working pastor; he does not worry or terrify him; he leads him gently on to fresh fields and wider landscapes.

Should the preacher of the gospel be a social reformer? Dr. John Marshall Barker, Professor of Sociology in Boston University School of Theology, answers Yes. Should he be a politician? Again Professor Barker answers Yes. Not a partisan politician, however. 'The Church in its corporate capacity is not primarily a political institution for enacting and enforcing laws. It is rather an association of believers who have affiliations with different political parties. Consequently it would be improper for the Church, made up of all parties, to become involved in partisan politics. The Church disclaims any desire to have an organic alliance with any political party as such. There is, however, a broad distinction between politics and partisan politics. Citizenship in a democracy carries with it the obligation of political action, but not necessarily partisan motives and activities. The function of Christian citizenship is a sacred trust and cannot be separated from the religious life. It is as much under the law of Christ as membership in the Church. The interest of every commonwealth demands that the Christian religion permeate the political life.'

Professor Barker goes over the whole wide territory designated social life and shows that the gospel has to 'permeate' every part of it. He writes as one who knows what he writes about. He is full of an enthusiasm for humanity, but he never lets his emotion carry him into intolerance. The title of the book is *The Social Gospel and the New Era* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net).

The *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society* for 1918–1919 (Longmans; 5s. net) contains the reports of the Proceedings during the Session. These reports themselves contain valuable original material for the Egyptologist—Notes by Professor Flinders Petrie on Prehistoric Egypt; by the Rev. I. Raffalovich on Palestine and the Jewish Future; by Professor G. Elliot Smith on the Intercourse between Egypt, Sumer, and Elam; by Dr. A. M. Blackman on the House of the Morning; and by Mr. T. Eric Peet on Ancient Mining in Syria. The Special Papers are more 'special' than usual, but they are of first-rate value for the research student.

A rival to the Yale Lectures on Preaching has been instituted in the University of Southern California. The first series of the 'New Era' Lectureship, as it is called, was delivered by Adna Wright Leonard, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The subject is *Evangelism in the Re-making of the World* (Methodist Book Concern; $1.25 net). There are six lectures. Each lecture stands by itself. For the lecturer's aim is to discuss the great principles of evangelism—'the principles that are fundamental to all evangelism'—and then leave the re-making of the world to his hearers. Three living issues receive special attention—the hymns to be sung at evangelistic services, the relation of revival work to social service, and the best use to be made of the Sunday evening service.

Mr. W. Scott Palmer read in Dr. Alexander Whyte's Appreciation of Behmen (as, following William Law, he calls the philosopher): 'It were an immense service done to our best literature if

some of Behmen's students would go through all Behmen's books, so as to make a complete collection and composition of the best of the autobiographic passages. . . . It would then be seen by all, what few, till then, will believe, that Jacob Behmen's mind and heart and spiritual experience all combine to give him a foremost place among the most classical masters in that great field.' He resolved to do it, and did it. The book is called *The Confessions of Jacob Boehme* (Methuen; 5s. net). It has an Introduction by Miss Evelyn Underhill. But it is itself an introduction—after Dr. Whyte the best you are likely to find, to the study of Boehme, first the study of the man, and then the study of the system. One characteristic must be emphasized—it is as *readable* a mystical book as you ever read.

Is Swete's Introduction to the study of the Septuagint superseded already? Mr. Richard R. Ottley, M.A., the author of *Isaiah according to the Septuagint*, has published *A Handbook to the Septuagint* (Methuen; 8s. net). It is an evidence of the activity of scholarship and of the interest that Biblical Study possesses for the acutest intellects.

But perhaps Mr. Ottley does not intend to supersede Swete. His manner is rather more elementary. Swete seemed to write for the man who had already studied his edition of the Septuagint; Ottley seems to write for the man who has to be enticed to that study. He will be of most service to the man who has the Septuagint in his hands and is working his way through it. He explains the words and phrases; he illustrates the text and the style; he tells the history of the translation that he may enable the student to understand the peculiarities of it; he suggests books for further study; and he adds a glossary for reference.

That glossary is itself of much value to the student. It saves time; it saves misunderstanding. Take one word of it:

'Samaritan Pentateuch.—What is usually meant, when this name is used, is the Hebrew Pentateuch in the Samaritan characters, which is in a recension differing from the M.T., and not infrequently agreeing with the LXX against it. At one time there was an idea that its text might prove superior to the M.T.; Gesenius, about a century ago, crushed this completely for the time, but something has been heard of it again recently. It is, however, impossible to maintain the extreme antiquity of the recension, or of the MSS. of it, as dating from the settlement of the Samaritans in Palestine. The Samaritan *translation* of this recension exists, but is considered less important.'

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have issued a fifth edition of Mr. Robert Caldwell's *In Everything by Prayer* (6d.).

The Life of Hudson Taylor has been told in two very bulky volumes. Not every one who would profit by his example can buy or read them. So Mr. Marshall Broomhall, M.A., has condensed them into one quite small volume, missing scarcely a telling anecdote. It is called *Hudson Taylor, The Man who Dared* (Morgan & Scott; 2s. net).

Two valuable though small books have been published by the National Adult School Union. One contains studies on *The Fourth Gospel*, by Anna L. Littleboy (6d.). The other is called *A Little Book of Meditation and Prayer* (6d.). It is compiled by the Rev. G. Currie Martin, B.D.

Messrs. Nelson have reissued *The Reminiscences of Lady Dorothy Nevill* in their 'Edinburgh Library of Non-Fiction Books' (2s. 6d. net). The most striking thing in the book is the evidence it affords of the existence and power of sheer superstition among the aristocracy. The story of the bambino or Buddha, whichever it was, which brought ill-luck into Lady Dorothy's house is told so graphically and so sincerely as at once to thrill and to bewilder.

The Tercentenary of the sailing of the *Mayflower* is to be celebrated by the issue of many attractive books. But none of them will surpass in attractiveness the new edition of Dr. Alexander Mackennal's *Homes and Haunts of the Pilgrim Fathers* which has been published by the Religious Tract Society (12s. net), revised and partly rewritten by the Rev. H. Elvet Lewis, M.A. The chief attraction is the magnificent series of illustrations, many of which are full-page plates and some in colour. Magnificent is not too strong an epithet. The reading is right good also. It was good before, and it is better since Mr. Elvet Lewis had his hand in it.

The Rev. A. R. Whitman, M.A., Principal of Culham College, has written *The History of the Christian Church to the Separation of East and West* (Rivingtons; 6s. net). We take it to be a continuation of his work on the history of the whole Church of God, of which he has already published the volumes on the Old Testament and the New. And for so great a task he is exceptionally qualified. Moreover, he has the enviable ability to write at once for the student and for the general reader. To dip into this volume with its Questions and Subjects for study is to set it aside if you are not a student, to read a page of it is to repent of your first impulse.

Mr. Herbert Morgan has written a book on *The Social Task in Wales* (S.C.M.; 2s. net). He writes as an ardent Christian, but he is not well pleased with the Welsh preachers. They are too emotional; 'the ethical note has been wanting, or else it has made too much of the titheing of mint, cummin, and anise.' But the Welsh Church is worse than its preachers. The common people, he says, accuse her of insincerity, worldliness, otherworldliness, ecclesiasticism, sabbatarianism, excessive puritanism, obscurantism, and undemocratic tendencies — a formidable list. 'If the Church is to be the true friend of men in their need and the effective instrument of the Kingdom, it must be an organic society, a real fellowship embodying the kindly and mighty Christian spirit.'

The Rev. A. Herbert Gray, M.A., D.D., is the author of *The Christian Adventure* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). Dr. Gray's gift as a preacher is directness. He has it by nature; he has perfected it by the experience of life, for he has worked among soldiers and workers. He is direct, but he is not materialistic. He believes in the grace of God and urges its recognition on his audience. 'Here is the great secret. The great things of the world's history have not been done merely by the power of human brains and genius—not by resoluteness of will, and enormous exertions of self-directed energy. They have come to pass through men and women who yielded themselves up to God to be used by Him, and very often they themselves were vastly astonished at the things which God brought to pass through them.'

There are those to whom Unity is undesirable; competition in religion is as good as in business. There are those who desire Unity, but only for ecclesiastical advantage. There are those who believe that the well-being of the Church of Christ is wrapped up in it. The Rev. Neville S. Talbot is the earnest advocate of the healing of the rents in the Lord's Body. He has published *Thoughts on Unity* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). They are consecutive thoughts. The argument grows in power with each new chapter. They are tolerant and very courteous thoughts. But the difficulty cannot be evaded: the United Church of Mr. Talbot's thoughts must be an Episcopal Church. 'I believe there is hope that those who agree in believing in one Church of God will find in episcopacy that which is representative of its God-given unity. I cannot believe that men will agree that the Church is divine because it is episcopal. But I believe there is hope that they will agree that, as it is divine, its divine character as one and visible and universal is represented by an episcopally ordained ministry. And I believe that if they do so agree they will accept it for the sake of the unity of the Body.'

The new contribution to the S.P.C.K. 'Texts for Students' is *Selections from the 'Historia Rerum Anglicarum' of William of Newburgh*, made by Charles Johnson, M.A. (1s. 3d. net).

One of the most important volumes of 'Translations of Christian Literature,' issued by the S.P.C.K. under the editorship of the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., and the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., is a translation of *Dionysius the Areopagite on the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology* (7s. 6d. net). The translation was made by Mr. C. E. Rolt, who died in early manhood, after he had passed the book for press. It is the translation of an enthusiast and a scholar—the scholarship and the enthusiasm working together to produce the highest results to be attained in prose translation. Nor is the Introduction less successful. Dr. Sparrow Simpson warns the reader against one or two of the decisions (as if they were due to too high an admiration for the author), and that is all right. But there the book stands, a real monument to an accomplished and warm-hearted man's memory, a valuable addition to the books on the literature of the fifth century.

A volume of translations of *Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church* (7s. 6d. net) has been added to that most enterprising and already indispensable series, the S.P.C.K. 'Translations of Christian Literature.' The first volume, edited by the Rev. B. J. Kidd, D.D., goes down to A.D. 313. Dr. Kidd has the subject well in hand. There are other selections which we do not doubt he consulted, but he has worked over the material himself, and his own judgment is well trained. For the translations he has relied upon the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library,' and the other great collections. The volume is well printed and well bound, altogether as immediately attractive as it will be at all times instructive.

To the 'Christian Revolution Series,' issued from the Swarthmore Press, the Rev. John Coates, B.A., has contributed a volume on *The Christ of Revolution* (2s. 6d. net). The title is strictly accurate. And His revolution was not only individual (though it *was* individual) but also social. Repent and be baptized, every one of you, and then the Kingdom of Heaven. In short arresting paragraphs Mr. Coates shows us Christ at work revolutionizing both individuals and society.

The idea of *The Remnant* comes to us from Isaiah. But Dr. Rufus M. Jones, in a book with that title (Swarthmore Press; 5s. net), shows that it is Greek as well as Hebrew, and Christian more than either Hebrew or Greek. A short chapter suffices for Plato's doctrine, and a short chapter is all that is given to Isaiah. For Dr. Jones' purpose is to trace the existence and worth of the Remnant down through the Christian ages. He finds the Remnant in the Montanists, in the Donatists, in the 'Religious' of Roman monachism, in the Spiritual Franciscans, in the Poor Men of Lyons, in the Friends of God, in the Reformers, and in the Quakers. And always he finds that they were the salt of the earth. But were they not schismatic? Dr. Jones reminds us that the most schismatic of all the Remnants were the earliest Christians. There have, no doubt, been two types —the rebel type and the type which aims at reform within the body. But there is no hiding the sympathy of Dr. Jones with the rebels.

The Disciplined Life: An Ideal of the Pastoral Epistles.

By the Reverend J. M. E. Ross, M.A., Golders Green.

In the Pastoral Letters as we have them there are many signs of what some one has called 'the old age of the primitive Church.' This perhaps, more than any mere differences in style or vocabulary, justifies the modern tendency to regard them as only partially Paul's. If we cut out the famous passage about the finished course and the crown of righteousness, and a few other verses which seem to have the authentic Pauline ring, and then read the rest with a mind sensitive to atmosphere, we feel we are in touch with a time when the great adventure of the early Church is over. The Church is settling down into an institution. Careful organization is taking the place of eager impulse. The immediate concern is orthodoxy more than evangelism. There is an emphasis upon the steady-going routine of morality which is closer to the Christian literature of the second century than to the Pentecostal fervour in which morality is swallowed up by love. It looks as though the primitive glow and rapture were gone: Christianity is getting into its grooves.

It is characteristic of this atmosphere that there should occur in these letters with quite unusual frequency the words *quietness*, *sobriety*, *gravity*, with other words of kindred type. The moral ideal seems here to centre in such thoughts: there is scarcely a class in the Christian community to which the standard is not applied. The simplest way to gather the impression will be to run through the Epistles as they stand in our New Testament, and note the words as they come. Beginning then with the phrase in 1 Timothy which bids men pray for *a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness*

and gravity (2^2), we come upon the counsel that women should adorn themselves *in modest apparel with shamefacedness and sobriety* (2^9), and should *learn in quietness* (2^{11}), should *be in quietness* (2^{12}), and should continue in faith and love and sanctification *with sobriety* (2^{15}). It is not only the women, however, who are bidden to be *grave, temperate, faithful* (3^{11}). The bishops have their turn. The bishop is to be *temperate, sober-minded, orderly* (3^2): he is to *rule well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity* (3^4). The deacons are counselled in similar terms: they too must be *grave . . . ruling their children and their own houses well* (3^{12}). The same subdued note recurs in various minor or less direct ways, *e.g.* in the familiar reference to godliness *with contentment* (6^6). But passing to 2 Timothy, we learn there about the spirit of power and love and *sobering* (1^7), and we hear the counsel, *Be thou sober in all things* (4^5). Titus once more draws us into the same atmosphere. An elder's children are not to be *accused of riot or unruly* (1^6): he himself is to be *no brawler, no striker* (1^7), but *a lover of good, sober-minded, temperate* (1^8). Aged men, though one might have thought this counsel superfluous, are to be *temperate, grave, sober-minded* (2^2): the aged women likewise are to be *reverent in demeanour* (2^3). The younger women too are to be *sober-minded* (2^4): it somehow seems a long way from the happy raptures of the Gospel of the Infancy,—

. . . . . .
There was a little maiden
In blue and silver drest,
She sang to God in Heaven
And God within her breast.

It flooded me with pleasure,
It pierced me like a sword,
When this young maiden sang 'My soul
Doth magnify the Lord.'

The stars sing all together
And hear the angels sing,
But they said they had never heard
So beautiful a thing.
. . . . . .

—to these grey damsels of the Pastorals beneath a sky as grey as themselves. It may be the consolation of the latter that they find mates to match them: the younger men are also to be *sober-minded* (2^6), and are to be taught the lesson by a Christian messenger who must himself set the example of *gravity and sound speech* (2^8).

This is not like anything else in the New Testament. Cowper might have digested the substance of these letters before he wrote in *The Task* his memorable lines on Discipline:

In colleges and halls, in ancient days,
When learning, virtue, piety, and truth,
Were precious and inculcated with care,
There dwelt a sage called Discipline. His head,
Not yet by time completely silvered o'er,
Bespoke him past the bounds of freakish youth,
But strong for service still and unimpaired.
His eye was meek and gentle, and a smile
Played on his lips, and in his speech was heard
Paternal sweetness, dignity and love.
The occupation nearest to his heart
Was to encourage goodness. He would stroke
The head of modest and ingenuous worth,
That blushed at its own praise; and press'd the youth
Close to his side that pleased him. Learning grew
Beneath his care a thriving vig'rous plant;
The mind was well informed, the passions held
Subordinate, and diligence was choice. . . .
But Discipline, a faithful servant long,
Declined at length into the vale of years:
A palsy struck his arm; his sparkling eye
Was quenched in rheums of age; his voice unstrung
Grew tremulous, and mov'd derision more
Than reverence in perverse rebellious youth.
So colleges and halls neglected much
Their good old friend, and Discipline at length,
O'erlooked and unemployed, fell sick and died.

The Pastorals must have been written before that tragedy happened; and Discipline, that faithful servant not only of learning but of goodness, must have stood at the writer's elbow to guide his pen. For the message here might perhaps better be summed up in the word *discipline* than in any other single word. A quiet life is the demand. Now public quiet can be secured only by private self-control: so the writer wants everybody—bishops, deacons, old people, young people—to be sober-minded.

But are these thoughts and phrases merely a reflexion of the old age of the primitive period and of the mood which that old age brought with it? or is there not something here which has a permanent value, especially in certain zones of experience, say after high excitements and in the reaction from great events? This is the deeper way to look at the matter, and when we see men and women, as here, setting themselves to a life of gravity and self-discipline, we see something that

is peculiarly sanitary and saving for human society. Two witnesses may speak for many observers. Lord Morley in his *Voltaire*, after speaking of the 'infinite vileness' of the system of the Church in the eighteenth century, adds these words:

> 'Is not every incentive and every concession to vagrant appetite a force that enwraps a man in gratification of self, and severs him from duty to others, and so a force of dissolution and dispersion? It might be necessary to pull down the Church, but the worst Church that has ever prostituted the name and the idea of religion cannot be so disastrous to society, as a Gospel that systematically relaxes self-control as being an unmeaning curtailment of happiness.'

These sober-faced and sober-dressed Christians, then, of the Pastorals were doing more than they knew to put coherence into the society of which they formed a part: they were, as their Master said, the salt of the earth, a preservative against dissolution and decay. Professor E. A. Ross of Nebraska University in his very able book, *Social Control* (Macmillan, 1912), is discussing the value to the social organism of the sense of fair-play.

> 'From the standpoint of peace and order, the race most hopeless is not the hard and aggressive race, but the race afflicted with seething explosive passions. Self-control, or the power to inhibit the passions, gives a man time to remember, to hear the other side, to discuss. Reflection favours that *thought-out* type of conduct which marks the fair-minded man. The problem of making a winning race is not, as some suppose, to blend closely certain egoistic with altruistic qualities,—as well mix oil with water!—but to unite the pushing, combative disposition with self-control and reflectiveness in such a way as to develop the *conscientious individualist.*

In an even deeper and more fruitful way than Political Economy allows for, the Conscientious Individualist is being here developed in the Pastorals before our eyes: and as he plods along in his modest, patient way he is the saving both of himself and of the social group to which he belongs.

1. Such a development of the conscientious and disciplined type is sorely needed in a nation at such a stage of its history as ours has now reached, in the backwash of the Great War. Ecstasies are over, alike of sorrow and of triumph: for national solvency, for future prosperity, our hope is in the steady people, the quietly efficient workers, whether they be Cabinet Ministers and public functionaries, or merely miners and bricklayers, the people who are not heady and high-minded, not passionate and changeful, but humble, serious, self-controlled. There would be an economic value in these Pastoral Epistles if we could bind them up with our national programmes; or rather there is a political and economic value in the Christian character, not least when it is seen from the angle at which these Letters view it. Oliver Wendell Holmes says there are three wicks to the lamp of a man's life—brain and blood and breath—and he quotes a French physiologist who calls these three things 'the tripod of life.' The statement is almost as true of a nation as of a human body. We have been spending blood and breath these recent years—rightly, but furiously and rapidly. It is time for brain to take control for a while, and plan out a reasoned and disciplined progress, lest we spend more blood and breath in foolish strife amongst ourselves. The tripod of life is breath and blood and brain. Might we not put it as it is put here—*power and love and sober-mindedness*? That will keep a nation's life going in the ordinary days when the tumult and the shouting die, and all the flags are laid away.

2. If the Church needed this disciplined type of character then, she needs it not less in any period when there seems no Pentecost in the calendar. Tongues of fire, rushing mighty winds, signs and wonders sometimes come. There are occasional leaders like Paul, half-man, half-seraph, who rush round the world like tornadoes, and whose prophetic word is like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces. These things are glorious while they last: they lift the Church out of the ruts: they open new vistas of possibility. Yet they pass,—and nobody is to blame. They pass in the nature of things, which has always something tidal, something rhythmic in it, subject to ebb and flow. And then the Church has to settle down to such seemingly commonplace matters as these Epistles describe,—the appointing of presbyters and deacons, the organizing of charities, the maintenance of a quiet and steady standard of sound

doctrine and sound living. Believing men will always have the sails trimmed to catch the breezes of the supernatural, and they will never cease asking God to blow with His Breath: yet even when the winds do not rush there is work to be done, and the labour of the 'dull mechanic oar' helps to keep the ship of the Kingdom moving on. Indeed, it is difficult to say how credit should be divided between the great Apostles of the first Christian generation and the quiet folk who succeeded them and carried on their work. In one sense Christianity owed everything, under the great Master Himself, to a man like Paul who opened the untrodden ways. Yet there would not have been much future for the faith without the quiet generations following, who had not perhaps much originality but were content simply to maintain and transmit what they had received. They were sober people working in a sober way, yet they had their share in the credit of the age-long task. And in many another uneventful period the quieter servants of the Kingdom of God have played their own part,—if not in creation then in continuity: and these somewhat subdued Epistles might be the charter of their sober devotion.

3. On the individual scale, we have here the New Testament parallel to that anti-climax of the prophet, which is after all a most splendid climax: 'They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary: *they shall walk, and not faint.*' In these Epistles we can see them doing it, after the ecstasies and excitements of the first days are over, 'giving a patient God their patient hearts' and walking with Him in the way of discipline and duty. It is worth while, then or now, to be among them. 'For the grace of God hath appeared,' as we are here told in a sentence not yet quoted, 'bringing salvation to all men, instructing us to the intent that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live *soberly and righteously and godly* in this present world, looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.' This programme for Puritans, unpretentious though it be, is launched with great expectations. For it is one of the most blessed elements in the Blessed Hope that, in the hour of final recompense, God's quietest servants shall be acknowledged and even His common soldiers shall be crowned.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'Be of good courage, and let us play the men for our people . . . and the Lord do that which seemeth him good.'—1 Ch 19[13].

THERE was a children's party one summer day at a beautiful house in Devonshire. If you had been there you would have seen a boy of six being held out at arm's length by a servant; he was dripping wet just like a half-drowned puppy. The beautiful house was the boy's own home, and he had been showing his companions how cleverly he could jump a stream that ran through the garden. He was born in June 1868, so more than likely this was his birthday party.

His name was Robert Falcon Scott, but at home and by his friends he was known as 'Con.' He was a venturesome little chap, very fond of fun, and he just loved pretending things. A pond near at hand was the ocean. A battleship lay moored there, which ship was simply a plank of wood; Con was an Admiral. But the ship belonged to the enemy and was damaging trade in his country; no wonder that he walked about gazing at it with a very determined look upon his face thinking what could be done to get rid of a thing that was becoming a terror to Devonshire. His sisters and his brother kept trotting by his side, watching his face all the time; they were his crew. Con decided to blow the hateful thing up with home-made gunpowder. When, after several attempts, he succeeded, how his crew cheered.

He was a regular brick. Some one had given him a knife in a present, and he wanted very much to use it on a tempting twig that he saw. His father happened to be with him at the time. 'If you hurt yourself,' he said to Con, 'don't expect any sympathy from me.' He did cut himself,

rather badly too, but he made no complaint: he just put the bleeding hand into his pocket, and talked away to his father as if nothing had happened.

He sometimes seemed dreamy. They teased him about this at home and called him 'Old Mooney.' His dreaminess may have arisen from the fact that although he was very plucky he was not really strong. He succeeded in getting into the Navy however, although he had not the required number of inches round the chest. It was said that when he was a cadet he had a very sharp temper; but he must have conquered it. His sunny smile was what all his friends remembered best: if there were tempers they never reached the surface.

In 1894, when he was twenty-six, he had a chance of showing what was really in him. His father had lost a great deal of his money, leaving the mother with little to keep up the house. Con, now a Lieutenant, wrote a wonderfully beautiful letter to her—the letter of a good son—offering to take the whole burden of the family upon his shoulders. How do you think he began doing this? He tried to keep his bedroom tidy during his holidays as they now had fewer servants; he made up his mind to be more careful of his clothes and the way he put them on, and he decided to spend as little as possible on his uniform. But although he sometimes arrived home in frayed garments with very tarnished lace, he kept himself as neat as a pin and an example to all young naval officers.

One can imagine how he looked the morning that he met Sir Clements Markham in London and offered to go as Commander of the Antarctic Expedition then about to set out. He was full of enthusiasm, you may be sure. He did not know that those at the head of things had made up their minds to offer him the very position he was trying to secure. They considered Scott the best man for the post, either in the Navy or out of it. So, promoted to the rank of Commander of the *Majestic*, he was free to undertake the work waiting for him.

You love reading stories of adventures, don't you? Captain Scott's voyages were full of them. But greater than the interest of all these, as told in the story written by Charles Turley, is the glory of a heroism such as the world has rarely seen.

One hardly likes to think of our old friend, now Captain Scott, being faced with disappointments, even tragedies, on every journey. Yet so it was; and when, after terrible hardships, he and his party at last reached the South Pole, it was to find that the Norwegians had been there before them. How the brave leader's heart would sink when he first got a glimpse of their black flag fluttering on the top of a cairn!

There were four men with Captain Scott when he reached the Pole. On the terrible journey back two of them sickened. But even at the risk of exhausting their provisions and being overtaken by the autumn storms, dear old Con could not but wait for them. He was the same brave, tender-hearted boy who wrote the beautiful letter to his mother. 'We have stuck to our sick companions to the last,' he wrote in his journal. They died on the way. Only two remained, and these were kept united by the heroism of their leader. They could not but worship him.

When, after a certain time, the party at the base found that Scott and his friends failed to appear, a section of them set out to look for them. They failed to find any trace of them; but a second scouting party came upon the tent in which Captain Scott and his two companions had lain down to die. Scott's arm was thrown across Wilson, the one he loved best. A wallet containing three notebooks was under his shoulder. He had written to the relatives of the two brave men, as well as to his own nearest and dearest, and to some of those specially interested in the expedition.

To the wife of his dear friend Wilson he wrote: 'I can do no more to comfort you, than to tell you that he died as he lived, a brave true man, the best of comrades, and staunchest of friends.'

To the mother of Bowers he said, 'He remains unselfish, self-reliant and splendidly hopeful to the end.'

About his own little boy he wrote, 'Guard him against indolence. Make him a strenuous man. I had to force myself into being strenuous, as you know—had always an inclination to be idle.'

Great Heart is dead, say they?
Nor dead nor sleeping! He lives on! His name
Shall kindle many a heart to equal flame.

A soul so fiery sweet can never die,
But lives and loves and works through all eternity.[1]

To read the Life of Captain Scott is to learn that he became worthy of the name of Great Heart through constant trust in God.

[1] J. Oxenham, *Bees in Amber*, 22.

II.

The Man who died for Prince Charlie.

'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.'—Jn 15^{13}.

Those of you who are learning history know the mad, sad, glorious story of the '45 Rebellion. You remember how Prince Charles Edward Stuart came over to Scotland to claim the crown for his father, James, the Old Pretender. You recall how at first his cause met with success and then with dismal failure, and how at last it was lost for ever on the bloody field of Culloden. The thing that Scotsmen like best to remember about that old, sad story is the magnificent loyalty of the Scottish Highlanders. Although the Young Pretender wandered amongst their hills and moors for six long months, although thirty thousand pounds was offered to the man or woman who should lead to his arrest (and thirty thousand pounds was untold wealth to a wretchedly poor people), not one person was found to betray him.

There are many thrilling tales still told in the Scottish Highlands of the wonderful escapes made by the Prince, and of how men and women risked their lives and their all to save him, but the finest I ever heard was told to me by an old Roman Catholic priest who lived near Inverness.

In the autumn of 1746 Prince Charlie was believed to be somewhere in the neighbourhood of Fort Augustus, and Cumberland's soldiers were searching for him. Now it so happened that near that spot there lived a man who bore a close resemblance to the Prince. In height, in colouring, in figure, in gait, he was very like him, so like that at a casual glance he might have been mistaken for him. One evening this man was crossing a lonely mountain path on his homeward way, when he was met by a band of Cumberland's soldiers. The soldiers recognized the resemblance at once. Some of them had seen Prince Charlie in the flesh, the rest had learned his description by heart, but—they were not sure. So they stopped the man and evidently in a somewhat blunt and clumsy fashion they began to question him, 'Are you Charles Edward Stuart?' they asked. In a flash the man realized the mistake and realized, too, how he might save the Prince. 'Well, what do you think?' he replied coolly. 'We think you are,' was the answer. 'Do you deny it?' Proudly the man drew himself up, as proudly as any king might: 'I do not,' he said.

Well, the soldiers arrested the brave fellow and took him away to London. Meanwhile there was a fortnight's lull in the search for the Prince, and in that lull Charles Edward Stuart escaped to France. In London the mistake was discovered, and the man who had given himself up instead of the Prince was put to death for his loyalty to the Jacobite cause.

That is a fine story. Can you think of a finer? Can you think of Somebody who gave Himself up, not instead of a prince, but instead of the poor and the needy and the wayward? Can you think of Somebody who because He loved so much laid down His life, not just for His friends, but for those who had often hurt Him and turned away from Him. Can you think of Somebody who laid down His life for you and me?

III.

The Lost Coin.

'What woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a lamp, and sweep the house, and seek diligently until she find it?'—Lk 15^{8}.

Are you clever at finding things that are lost? Little people usually are, perhaps because their eyes are so sharp. If a penny or a sixpence curls away on the floor, give me a boy or girl to find it. You know all the tricks of the best way to set about it. You flop down on your knees at once and crawl under the tables and chairs. If that fails you lay your cheek against the floor so that your eye may be on a level with the ground and very likely you discover the missing coin that way. If not you turn back the rug and poke your fingers under the edge of the carpet, or you take a stick and fish about with it under any piece of furniture that has a small space between itself and the floor. And in less time than it takes to tell how you do it you produce the lost sixpence.

Sometimes it is something more valuable than a sixpence that you are called in to help to find—the glass of grandfather's spectacles, or the key of father's desk; mother's brooch, or one of her rings. Sometimes what is lost does not appear to you worth all the fuss that is being made about it, till you hear its owner say, 'It is not the actual value of the thing, it is its associations that make it precious to me.' Then you understand that what

seems to you a trifle is of priceless value to its owner, because it was the gift of some dear friend or it recalls some special occasion.

Now to-day's text makes us think of the hunt for some seeming trifle such as that. Christ was talking to the Scribes and Pharisees, those men who were always criticising Him and complaining that He was too friendly with the people whom they contemptuously called 'publicans and sinners.' Christ wanted to show those Scribes and Pharisees that the people they despised were inestimably precious to God. Christ had a special name for such people. He loved to speak of them as 'lost' —He thought of them as children of God who had wandered away in paths of their own foolish choosing till they had lost the road to the Father's house. Christ said He had come to this world for the very purpose of seeking and saving such 'lost' people. He had come to tell them that God was ever looking for them and longing for them, and would not be satisfied till He had them all safe at home. On this occasion Christ told three stories to explain how God felt about the matter—the story of the lost sheep, the story of the lost or prodigal son, and, wedged between them, to-day's text—the story of the lost coin.

We cannot tell if Christ invented this story. Quite as likely He was just recalling something that had happened in His own childhood. He may have been going back to a day when Mary, His mother, had been greatly distressed because she had lost one of the ten small silver coins which she, like other married Eastern women, wore strung as an ornament on her forehead. For those who know about such things tell us that the coin mentioned here is a Greek coin and not the usual Roman silver coin for spending which is spoken of in other parts of the New Testament. That string of dangling coins had been given to Mary by her husband on her wedding day. It was as sacred and precious to her as your mother's wedding-ring is to your mother, so no wonder she was sadly grieved when one of the coins slipped from its fastening. Perhaps Christ helped her to look for it. Perhaps He was so small at the time that He only watched with breathless interest whilst His mother turned the house upside down in search of it.

Turning the house upside down was rather a different operation in the East in Christ's day from what it is in our homes to-day. There were no wardrobes to ransack and very few pieces of furniture to move about. But hunting for a small thing not much larger than a silver sixpence would not be easy, for there was no light in an Eastern peasant's house except the scant rays that entered by the open doorway. So first Mary lit a lamp, then she lifted and shook the straw or reed mats that were the only kind of carpet she had, and then she took a broom and carefully swept every inch of the hard-beaten clay floor. As she swept she stooped every now and then, and with lamp in hand examined closely the pile of sweepings. At last her eye caught the glitter of silver, and with a cry of joy she bent down and picked up from the heap of dust her lost treasure.

And then what a scene of rejoicing there was! Mary ran to the door and called to her neighbours the good news, and they gathered round the threshold, and turned over the recovered coin in their hands, and all talked at once, and exclaimed how glad they were that it had been found.

When Christ had got so far in the story He added the most important bit of all. He told the Scribes and Pharisees that there was as great joy among the angels in heaven when one of God's lost children was found, as there was among Mary's neighbours when she discovered her missing coin.

A Sunday school teacher was once relating this story to a class of small boys. They listened very quietly till she came to the words, 'And she swept and swept, till at last she found it.' There was silence for a moment and then one little fellow held up his hand, 'But,' he inquired anxiously, 'where *did* she find it?' He wanted to know the exact spot.

Well, as we have already said, it was most likely in a pile of dust and rubbish that the coin was found. And that is where many of God's lost children are to be found to-day. In the lanes and alleys of our great cities, amidst all their squalor and dirt and misery there are thousands of God's lost children, lost, like the coin, through no fault of their own. Would you not like to help God to find them? When you grow a little older you can do it by going down and working in the missions. But even now you can help by giving your pennies; by gathering bunches of flowers from the woods or from your gardens to send to those who live in these cheerless streets; by sparing a toy or two from your store for some little sick boy or girl.

These may seem very little things to you, but they are your share of Home Mission work, and they are not little in God's sight.

The Christian Year.

Second Sunday after Trinity.

The Christian.

'Follow me. And he arose and followed him.'—Mk 2^{14}.

What is a Christian? What in these days of ours must a genuine follower of Christ be?

1. He is the man with a strange faith. He believes that Christ is the only rightful Lord of all life, and he is in earnest with that belief. He is one who realizes that Christ has laid hold upon him for an intensity of life and experience in relation with values that transcend material values altogether. He is the man who perceives that in Christ there are manifested moral principles which, in themselves and by virtue of their embodiment, are absolute; and moral principles, moreover, whose meaning is destroyed unless taken in connexion with the social life of this world, here and now.

2. The follower of Christ is he who has been gripped by the conviction of divine humanity in every child of earth, by the certainty that the standard and meaning of human life are to be found only in persons bearing the Life of God within them, and who sees, therefore, that to manifest Christ in the world we must have and create a social system which shall look first of all to personality as its ruling conception and most important fact, and shall throughout be designed and worked to further the ends of personality, and to set free all the divine powers proper to the human individual.

3. The follower of Christ, again, is he who has been caught up into the overwhelming discovery that no earthly thing, no material thing, no merely temporal thing whatsoever, is ever at any time or for any reason, to be pursued for its own sake, to the detriment and disregard of souls, and who, therefore, will not accept a society or any social method which is motived by desire to acquire material things, or to accumulate worldly wealth, or to achieve material power, or which sets up any of these things, openly or in subtle disguise, as a worthy object of human endeavour, an incentive to human action, or, still more blasphemously, a ground for exacting human loyalty and self-sacrifice.

4. The follower of Christ, once more, is he who has felt his soul wrapped into the vast, determining realization of fellowship, equal and free, and resting only on the soul's capacity for love, and who, therefore, perceives and bears witness to the fact that equal and free fellowship of souls necessitates equality of opportunity in relation to all the possibilities of body and mind, equality of service, equality of approach to and of sharing in the material riches of earth and the results of human toil, and who sees that mankind must organize for fellowship, and that, if they are so to organize, they must cease forthwith from the hopeless task of organizing for 'the production and acquisition of material wealth'—a task which inevitably breeds not fellowship but fear, covetousness, and disunity—and give themselves quite fearlessly to the task of organizing for the pursuit of knowledge, or beauty, or joy, or the development of the human spirit, which things alone can be pursued for their own sake without breaking of fellowship, and actually to its upbuilding.

We might add much more to this, but it is enough for the moment. The follower of Christ is, we say, at the least a man who perceives these ethical principles embodied in his Lord, who accepts them as absolute for himself and mankind, as controlling the deepest intention of his own life and the one desirable goal for humanity, and who turns them, where to-day they must be turned, towards criticism of his existing social and industrial surroundings, methods, and valuations, and towards unremitting effort to destroy those surroundings where they fail of conformity to his principles, to strengthen whatever in them shows promise of Christ, and in all things to accept in his inward heart and personal life the consequences of both the necessary destruction and the new creation.[1]

Third Sunday after Trinity.

A Living Stone.

'To whom coming as unto a living stone.'—1 P 2^4.

We have here a passage in which our Lord and Master is described under imagery which is unique—'A living stone.' This presentation of the Christ has no exact parallel anywhere else. In many

[1] S. A. Mellor, *Jesus Christ and Social Change*.

places we have Him before us as the Rock, as the Stone; the Rock of Ages, the Foundation Stone, the Stone on which it is good to build, with which it is death to collide. And again and again we have the Lord before us as not merely *living*, but *the Life*: 'Christ, which is our life.' But in this remarkable passage we see the two views converging into one. We have the Rock, and it is alive. We have the Life, and it is embodied in the grandeur and solidity of the Rock.

1. He is the 'living *Stone*,' Christ the Rock, Christ the mighty, the immovable, the everlasting; 'Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever'; the fact that can never be shaken, the supreme, the all-embracing fact. For the Lord is not merely a fact in the world of being; the world of being exists in the fact of Him. It is said of a mediæval saint, Juliana of Norwich, that she once had a vision of her Lord. There was in His hand a small round thing, 'about the size of a filbert nut,' and it was told her that that was 'all things that had been made'; it was the created Universe. The relation of the created Universe to the eternal Christ was as the relation of a small thing held in the hand to the mighty man who holds it.

'Gentle Jesus, meek and mild, look upon a little child.' I have heard dear children sing, this afternoon, those sweet words with their sweet voices, and they went through my soul. We shall never get beyond that child-truth—the 'gentle Jesus, meek and mild.' Not only the child wants Him; the old broken heart wants Him, and the old bewildered mind wants Him; and the man in the strength and fulness of life must surely know enough about himself, and about other things, to feel that he too wants divine gentleness when his soul is sore. But let us recollect that, while this is one infinitely precious side of the truth of our Master, there is this side of majesty and of might with it all, giving it all its infinite value. He is the Rock of Ages, against which the stream of immeasurable time is but a puny rivulet as it flows round Him who is the same for ever and ever. The 'perpetual mountains' are but shadows and passing clouds to this Lord eternally the same. Let us thank Him for that.

2. But then, this wonderful Lord Christ, the Rock that cannot change or shake, 'the Rock that never crumbled yet,' the Rock on which it is so good to rest and so good to build, is, we see here, wonderfully more than Rock. He is the *living* Stone, the *living* Rock. The apostle does not trouble himself to reconcile the imagery; he leaves it to faith to put it right, to take the two great truths as to the Lord Christ and accept them both together: they will fit spiritually into each other at once. This Rock lives. This rock has a heart to love, this Rock has a mind to plan for good and blessing, this Rock has arms to embrace, and a paternal tenderness, yea, and a maternal, for 'as one whom "his mother comforteth," so will I comfort you.' This Rock has eyes to see deep into our inmost need, and ears to hear the least perceptible sigh of our troubled hearts. It is the living Rock, it is the loving Rock; it is a Rock whose stability is but a tool in the hands of its love, whose mass is but the implement of its mercy.

Very long ago I was told, by a lady in my native region, this incident of her father's life. He was a saintly Nonconformist minister, in the hilly country of the west of Dorset. A gipsy clan pitched its tents in his neighbourhood, and the good man soon went among them, seeing what he could do for his Lord. He found the son of the old chief very ill, gone far in consumption. The youth could read a little; the good pastor taught him to read better, and gave him a large print Testament; and he was permitted to lead him to the feet of Jesus. In a short time the encampment moved, going all along the south of England to Kent, and nothing passed for some while between them and their faithful friend. Then there came one day to the pastor's door a white-headed gipsy, the chief of the little camp. He asked to see the gentleman, and then produced a book. It was the Testament given to his son. 'My poor lad told me to give you this book, and to tell you to look through it. There are places marked with a burnt stick from the fire, where the words did good to his soul. I cannot read a letter. You must look and see. But there is one place, he said, where you will find *two marks*. They are against the words that did most good of all to him.' And behold, the place was He 7^{25}: 'He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him.'[1]

Fourth Sunday after Trinity.

The Freedom of the Will.

'Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.'—Ro 12^{21}.

Between the two possibilities, of being overcome of evil or overcoming evil by good, the will of man decides, and the salvation of man is the outcome of the union of the human will with the Divine. This is the will of God, even your sanctification; correspondence with God's will and co-operation with His grace is man's part in that process which results in the life of glory. Since the will of man holds so responsible a place in the spiritual life, we must consider the dangers that threaten the freedom of the will.

1. Of these the first is *Habit*. A bad habit is

[1] H. C. G. Moule, *Christ and the Christian*.

disastrous; a good habit may be dangerous. Habit is repetition so constant that the exercise of will and the sense of responsibility are lost. A bad habit rivets the fetters till release becomes hopeless; a good habit may enervate the will by disuse, and leave reason and conscience unconsulted. To retain freedom of will it is wise to re-order the ordinary ways of life from time to time, and to vary the unimportant decisions of self-guidance. A ship of war that is kept in naval order, ready for a sudden call of duty, is not only cleared of barnacles and seaweed growth that might hinder speed; it is from time to time loosed from its moorings, that it may be made certain that at the call no entanglement will cause a fatal delay. It is wise to live in such free exercise of will as to make conscience and reason the temper of every action.

2. Again, it is necessary to watch against the weakening or paralysis of the will by *Social Influences*. When we ask, What *kind* of man is this? we are assuming that kinsmen are alike; when we ask, What *sort* of man is this? we are recognizing that a man's company forms his character, for 'sort' means group or company. A man having to make his own decisions will often act more wisely, and generally more kindly, than one who lives in a crowd and seems to share his responsibility with others. One may even make for oneself unconsciously a fictitious reputation, and one's acquaintances may attribute to one qualities good or bad which are entirely imaginary and unreal. In such a case a man may find himself committed by the fiction to courses that he would not take willingly. He may feel that he must say or do what is expected of him, and he has not the courage to disappoint a mistaken expectation. It is plain that in such a case one could not put off the old nature with its affections and lusts,—one could not become a new creature. Of Herod we read that when he heard the demand of Herodias for the head of John the Baptist, 'The king was sorry, but, nevertheless for his oath's sake and *them that sat at meat with him*, he commanded it to be given her, and he sent and beheaded John in the prison.' In choosing our friends we are in some measure selecting our future qualities of character; but we cannot resign our personal responsibility.

3. Very close to the will are the *Appetites and Desires* to which temptations make their direct appeal. And consequently we must reckon with these also as they may affect the great decisions. It is well known that certain indulgences dethrone the will finally; but, short of that, a moral weakness or a lack of vigilance against temptation inevitably produces an uncertainty or hesitation in the vital decisions of the spirit. St. Paul writes of himself, 'I will not be brought under by any creature.' It is a necessary rule for every Christian.

The temptations that seem to have their origin in the material world about us are not limited to the direct appeals to our natural appetites. There is sometimes the awakening of bad memories, or the exciting of evil passions, or the kindling of jealousies, or the prompting of covetousness—by association of thought, and through avenues and influences which in themselves are innocent. It was noted by one of our old English divines that the eye seems most neutral of all our members, and yet it is the immediate channel of many of our worst temptations, that it carries quickest the appeal to passion. For the senses, and not only the appetites, may be used by the great intruder, and all the ways to the heart must be kept jealously.[1]

Fifth Sunday after Trinity.

The Home.

'They went unto their own home.'—1 S 2^{20}.

What sort of home was it? When we remember, that the head of it was Elkanah and that Hannah was his wife, we can imagine. There are three characteristics of a good home.

1. The first of these characteristics is *Simplicity*. Simplicity, however, does not mean meagreness, or emptiness, or lack of comfort, or even the absence of luxuries. Some good homes are luxurious, and some are bare; and bad homes may be found among both poor and rich. Simplicity is the opposite of complexity; and the home which is blessed with simplicity is an uncomplicated and single-minded home, free from divisive interests and conflicting desires, finding its happiness in common sympathies and joys. A simple home, that is to say, is simply a home; not a step to something else, not an instrument of social ambition, not a mere sleeping-place, like a kennel into which a dog creeps for the night; but a centre of affectionate self-denial and mutual for-

[1] J. Wakeford, *From Ash Wednesday to Easter Day*.

bearance; an end in itself, as though the main concern for a family were simply to make a home and to keep it simple. When a boy discovers that his parents find their satisfaction elsewhere than in the home—in the club of the prosperous or in the saloon of the poor—then the boy also will follow the group-instinct as it leads him to the street or the gang; in so far as he sees the home satisfying his parents, it is likely to satisfy him.

2. The second mark of a good home is *Consistency*. The parental discipline of the home is to be chiefly maintained, not by precepts, but by the consistent conduct of the parents themselves. A boy is not easily moved by exhortation, but he is affected with extraordinary ease by contagion. A boy is in many points immature and unobservant, but one trait in him is highly developed—the capacity to detect anything that looks like humbug. If he observe any considerable inconsistency between precept and example, between exhortation and character, all the well-intended efforts of his home are likely to be in vain. Nothing is more contagious than a consistent life. We hear much of the self-propagating nature of disease and sin, but these ills which are contrary to nature are by no means so easily transmitted as is the contagion of goodness. No greater mistake can be made by parents than to fancy that a boy is naturally inclined to go wrong; and no mistake is so likely to make a boy go where he is expected to go. He can be bent, crooked, or kept straight like a growing bough; and the chief reason why goodness does not appear to him more tempting than sin is that goodness is seldom made so interesting, picturesque, or heroic as sin. In the Oriental picture of the shepherd and the sheep in the Fourth Gospel, the shepherd goes before and the sheep hear his voice and follow him. That is the only way to be a shepherd of boys. They are hard cattle to drive, but easy to lead. There is nothing they like better than a consistent, single-minded, straight-going leader, and when they hear his voice they follow him.

3. Out of the simplicity and consistency of a good home issues its third characteristic. It is that relation between children and their parents whose historical name is *Piety*. The word has not only become involved in religious implications, but also carries with it a suggestion of unreality, formalism, ostentation, or pretence. A pious person is apt to seem to a healthy-minded boy an artificial or sentimental creature. Yet Piety, in its Latin usage, was the name for the duty and loyalty of a child to its parents, or of a wife to her husband. Æneas, in Virgil, was called pious because he was a good son of Anchises. Piety toward God is, therefore, nothing else than the affection of a son translated into a religious experience. Man, as Jesus taught, is a child of God, and turns to God just as a human child turns to his father with loyalty and love. When the Prodigal Son comes to himself, he says, 'I will arise, and go to my Father.' Religion, that is to say, regards the universe as a home; and duty conceived as loyalty to God becomes Piety.

As the course of experience broadens with the years, and the problems and temptations of maturity confront the man who was once a boy, he looks back on these parents and this home with a piety which needs little expansion to become a part of his religion, and finds in that retreating reminiscence of his boyhood the most convincing picture which he can frame of the discipline and watchfulness of God. In a most profound and searching sense the prayer of Wordsworth is answered in the experiences of his life:

> The Child is father of the Man;
> And I could wish my days to be
> Bound each to each by natural piety.[1]

[1] F. G. Peabody, *The Religious Education of an American Citizen*.

The Grammar of the Greek New Testament.

By Professor the Reverend George Milligan, D.D., University of Glasgow.

The publication in 1822 of Dr. G. R. Winer's *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* marks an epoch in the study of the grammar of the Greek New Testament. 'The object proposed was to check the unbounded arbitrariness with which the language of the New Testament

had so long been handled in Commentaries and exegetical prelections,' and 'to rescue the New Testament writers from the bondage of a perverted philology,' to which for long they had been subject.

The value of Winer's book in these and other directions was quickly recognized, and, at the instance of Messrs. T. & T. Clark, it was translated into English in 1859 by Professor Edward Masson, at one time Professor in the University of Athens. Masson's acquaintance with modern spoken Greek had at least one important result, for it led him, upwards of sixty years ago, to anticipate the conclusion which recent papyrological research has so strikingly confirmed. 'The diction of the New Testament,' so he writes in the *Prolegomena* to the third edition of his translation (in 1861),[1] 'is the plain and unaffected Hellenic of the Apostolic Age, as employed by Greek-speaking Christians when discoursing on religious subjects.' And again, 'The style of the New Testament writers is, even in *linguistic* point of view, peculiarly interesting. Perfectly natural and unaffected, it is free from all tinge of vulgarity on the one hand, and from every trace of studied finery on the other. Apart from the Hebraisms — the number of which has, for the most part, been grossly exaggerated—the New Testament may be considered as exhibiting the only genuine *facsimile* of the colloquial diction employed by *unsophisticated* Grecian gentlemen of the first century, who spoke without pedantry—as *ἰδιῶται*, and not as *σοφισταί*' (pp. vii, viii).

The *Prolegomena*, from which these sentences are taken, were naturally dropped in the new translation by Dr. W. F. Moulton, which in 1870 took the place of Masson's work; but it is again significant that, in addition to the large number of new references to classical authorities which Moulton supplies, he also is careful to emphasize the 'striking coincidences' between modern Greek and the language in which the New Testament is written.

The result of these, and other improvements which he introduced, is that Winer-Moulton was for long recognized as the standard authority on the subject with which it dealt. No higher tribute indeed could be paid to its excellences than the frank statement by Bishop Ellicott, the chairman of the New Testament Revision Committee (1871–81), that this edition of Winer's time-honoured book was 'the true, though remote fountain-head of revision, and more particularly of the revision of the New Testament.' 'It was to Winer,' he continues, in tracing the history of the movement, 'that we were all indebted for that greater accuracy of interpretation of the Greek Testament which was recognized and welcomed by readers of the New Testament at the time I mention, and produced effects which had a considerable share in the gradual bringing about of important movements that almost naturally followed.'[2]

It was not to be expected, however, that Winer (or Winer-Moulton) could always retain its place as the standard grammar of the Greek New Testament, more especially in view of the new light that was being poured on the study of Greek letters from the inscriptions and from the papyri of Egypt. And the consequence was that a revised (the eighth) edition of the German Winer was projected by Professor P. W. Schmiedel of Zurich. Of this a first part was published in 1894, to be followed by two additional parts in 1897 and 1898, making 272 pages in all, and then further publication was abruptly stopped. It was generally understood that Schmiedel had found the work too much for himself, and had called in the assistance of Edward Schwyzer (formerly known as Schweizer), the author of a valuable monograph on the grammar of the Pergamene inscriptions,[3] and the present writer can recall how in 1907 Professor Schmiedel told him that he and his new colleague were at that time engaged in discussing together certain general principles, which might guide them in the future carrying on of their work. Whether sufficient agreement was not reached, or whatever the cause, no fresh part of the Grammar has since appeared, and it remains a torso, whose chief fault perhaps is, as Deissmann has pointed out,[4] that there is too much Winer and too little Schmiedel in the book.

Meanwhile the abandoned field had been so far occupied by the appearance in 1896 of Professor F. Blass's *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, of which an English translation was

[1] I have not access to the first edition of 1859, but, according to Dr. Rendel Harris, to whom I owe the reference, the passage there is substantially the same: see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xxv. p. 54 f.

[2] *Addresses on the Revised Version of Holy Scriptures* (London: S.P.C.K., 1901), p. 7 ff.

[3] *Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften* (Berlin, 1898). Schwyzer has also edited the third edition of K. Meisterhans' *Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften* (Berlin, 1900).

[4] *The Philology of the Greek Bible* (London, 1908), p. 114.

issued by Mr. H. St. John Thackeray two years later.[1] The name and reputation of the author, who had already shown his interest in New Testament studies by an edition of the Acts of the Apostles,[2] were in themselves sufficient to guarantee the outstanding merits of the new Grammar. At the same time there was ground for the criticism that Blass's interest in Greek on its classical and literary side had led to his treating the Greek of the New Testament too much as a thing by itself, or, from another point of view, had prevented his emphasizing so fully as he ought the truly vernacular and popular character of that Greek. That he himself was growingly conscious of this is evidenced by the additional references to the inscriptions and papyri, which are found in the second German edition of the Grammar,[3] while this line of illustration forms a distinctive feature of the completely revised and re-edited edition of Blass's work, which was brought out by A. Debrunner in 1913.[4]

It is hardly necessary to point out that the impetus in this line of study, which was to prove so fruitful in the better understanding of the Greek New Testament, was mainly due to two men—Adolf Deissmann in Germany, and James Hope Moulton in this country. Deissmann's interest in the Koine, as this vernacular Greek is generally described, was from the first mainly lexical.[5] But Moulton's activities had in addition been turned from an early date to the grammatical field. His father, Dr. W. F. Moulton, had long contemplated the crowning of his work on Winer by a new and up-to-date edition of the Grammar. And when he found that this was to be impracticable, so far as he himself was concerned, he handed on the task to his brilliant son.

Preparatory studies for the work had already been made by the younger Moulton in a series of articles contributed to the *Classical Review*,[6] and the *Expositor*,[7] in which the value of the new evidence for the study of the Greek of the New Testament was for the first time clearly brought before the English reader. And these were followed by a further series of articles,[8] which were eventually to form the basis of the now famous *Prolegomena*, first published in 1906.[9] No detailed description is required of a book which has come to be regarded as indispensable by all serious students of the New Testament in its original Greek, but, as showing the true character of the book, it may be mentioned that while Moulton, like Schmiedel before him, had started simply with the idea of revising Winer with the aid of the materials his father and he himself had collected, he soon found that much more was required than this. Only what was to all intents a new Grammar could meet the real needs of the case, and consequently, though at the time it was a sore trial to the writer's *pietät*, the words 'Based on W. F. Moulton's Edition of G. B. Winer's Grammar,' which had appeared on the title-page of the first Edition, were omitted as misleading in later issues (2nd edition, 1906; 3rd edition, 1908).[10]

[1] *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (London: Macmillan, 1898).

[2] *Acta apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter* (Göttingen, 1895).

[3] These additions are incorporated, for the most part in two appendixes, in the second English edition, which appeared in 1905, and was reprinted in 1911.

[4] Friedrich Blass, *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Vierte, völlig neugearbeitete Auflage besorgt, von Albert Debrunner (Göttingen, 1913).

[5] See, however the important notes on Orthography and Morphology in his *Bible Studies* (Edinburgh, 1901), pp. 18 ff., and the lectures on *The Philology of the Greek Bible*, already cited.

[6] *Classical Review*, xv. pp. 31–38 and 434–442 (February and December 1901), and xviii. pp. 106–112 and 151–155 (March and April 1904).

[7] *Expositor*, vi. iii. pp. 271–282, vii. pp. 104–121, and viii. pp. 423–439.

[8] *Expositor*, vi. ix. 67, 215, 310, 359, 461; x. 124, 168, 276, 353, 440.

[9] The full title was *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Based on W. F. Moulton's edition of G. B. Winer*, by James Hope Moulton. Vol. I., *Prolegomena* (Edinburgh, 1906.

[10] A German translation, undertaken largely at the instance of the late Professor A. Thumb, was published under the title *Einleitung in die Sprache des Neuen Testaments* (Heidelberg, 1911), in which it was found possible to incorporate in their true places in the body of the book the valuable additional Notes which are distributed over the Appendixes of the later English editions. A new English edition on the same lines, and making use further of the writer's latest materials from his own interleaved copies, would be a great boon to the English student.

Mention may also be made here of the compendious *Neutestamentliche Grammatik* (Tübingen, 1911) brought out by Dr. L. Radermacher as the first part of the useful *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*. The sub-title 'Das Griechisch des Neuen Testaments in Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache dargestellt' sufficiently indicates the point of view from which it is written. In view, too, of the close relation between the Greek of the Septuagint and the Greek of the New Testament, we may cite R. Helbing's *Grammatik der Septuaginta* (Göttingen, 1907), and H. St. John

Dr. Moulton had intended to complete his work by two additional volumes, one dealing more particularly with Accidence, and the other with Syntax. And the bulk of the materials for the first of these volumes was practically ready for the printer, when he left for a lecturing tour in India in 1914. The tragic and painful circumstances of his death on the return voyage in the summer of 1916 are known to all, and need not be repeated here. All that meanwhile we are concerned with is that for a time fears were widely felt that the completion of the Grammar would no longer be possible. But now, thanks to the devotion and skill of Dr. Moulton's old pupil and friend, Professor W. F. Howard, B.D., of Handsworth Theological College, Birmingham, these fears have been happily dispelled.

Under his editorship Part i. of Vol. II., dealing with General Introduction, Sounds and Writing, has already appeared, and Part. ii., occupied with Accidence, is at present passing through the press. A third Part on the important subject of Word Formation, which was left unfinished by Dr. Moulton, will be issued as soon as possible. And then Professor Howard will be free to devote himself to the concluding volume on Syntax, which Dr. Moulton had projected, but of which he had done little more than make a beginning. All who know Professor Howard, and have watched the skill and the patience with which he has thrown himself into his arduous task, are confident that the work could not be in better hands, and that through his devotion and loyalty Dr. Moulton's long-cherished scheme will at length be brought to a successful conclusion.

It is clear, however, that all this will take time. And our gratitude in consequence is all the greater to the distinguished American scholar and divine, Professor A. T. Robertson, of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, who has already made such important contributions to this particular line of New Testament study. Dr. Robertson's first publication of importance in the grammatical field was *A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (London, 1908; fourth edition, 1916), which at once found wide acceptance, and was translated into Italian, German, Dutch, and French. But useful as this Grammar was to the student, it was only to prove the precursor to what was in every sense of the phrase a *magnum opus—A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (London, 1914). Appearing as it did, shortly before the outbreak of the war, and, owing to its size and price, appealing directly only to a comparatively small circle of readers, it was hardly to be expected that Dr. Robertson's massive volume would find a ready sale. And no higher tribute to the book's inherent usefulness and worth can be paid than the demand for a second edition, again of 1500 copies, in the following year, while this in its turn has given place to what is described as a third and definitive edition, published only a few months ago. Well may the writer say in his Preface: 'It is pleasant to think that Greek is renewing its grip upon the world' (p. xviii).

It is manifestly impossible in an article such as the present to review in detail the 1500 pages to which in its latest form Dr. Robertson's Grammar has grown; but a brief Synopsis may give an idea of the richness and variety of their contents.

Part I. is perhaps the most interesting to the general reader, for here, after a comprehensive survey of the nature of the new material which is now at the disposal of the New Testament student, Dr. Robertson proceeds to discuss the origin and character of the Koine, in which, as we have already seen, it is now generally agreed that the New Testament for the most part was written. It is interesting, however, to notice that the more literary elements of certain books and passages are not thereby ignored, and also that Dr. Robertson is prepared to concede something, though perhaps not so much as is required in the present writer's opinion, to the Semitic influences by which the New Testament writers were surrounded. Full justice is done to the individual peculiarities of these writers, and in a concluding section the value of the Modern Greek vernacular for the illustration of the Greek of the New Testament is well brought out.

Thackeray's *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, vol. i. (Cambridge, 1909), neither of which has yet advanced beyond Orthography and Accidence. The same applies to E. Mayser's *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Leipzig, 1906), which is invaluable to the New Testament student, though it must be kept in view that the references, as the author indicates in his title, are only to the papyri of the Ptolemaic period. For an account of other literature bearing on our subject, which cannot be referred to here, see three articles by Professor H. A. A. Kennedy on 'Recent Research in the Language of the New Testament,' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xii. pp. 341 ff., 455 ff., and 557 ff.

Over 200 pages are then devoted to Accidence, with a wealth of reference and detail which is almost bewildering in its fulness. And these, again, are followed by a long Part III., devoted to the many and varied questions that arise under the head of Syntax. Here the full Table of Contents, which is a feature of the last edition, offers welcome aid to the student in discovering the guidance of which he is in search, especially when it is accompanied by perhaps the noblest series of Indexes which any volume of the kind possesses. The Index of Quotations from the New Testament alone runs to 90 pages of double columns, and there can be comparatively few verses which are not referred to somewhere in the volume. Full Indexes of Quotations from the Inscriptions, the Papyri and Ostraca, and Greek and Latin Literature are also provided. And then, as if all this were not enough, we have elaborate *Addenda* to the second and third editions, which include a number of extremely useful statistical tables on various points of grammar, prepared with extraordinary minuteness and care by the late Mr. H. Scott of Birkenhead, who had previously assisted Dr. Moulton in similar directions.

From what has been said, it will be at once realized that Dr. Robertson's book is far more than a mere Grammar. It is really a *Thesaurus* of all that bears on the language of our Greek Testament, brought together with the most painstaking diligence, and illuminating in countless unexpected ways the interpretation of the sacred books.

In these circumstances anything that suggests depreciatory criticism may well seem out of place and ungrateful. At the same time we cannot help wishing that, to make his book of a more workable size, Dr. Robertson had avoided a good many unnecessary repetitions, and had also reduced the number of his references to other authorities. That many such references are indispensable in a work of the kind goes, of course, without saying. But care should be taken not to multiply these, where they are not likely to be of real service to the student, and may even distract his attention from the main issues reached. There is also a want of uniformity in the manner of reference, more particularly to the papyrus citations, which may easily prove troublesome to the ordinary reader, and a few of these citations require correction. On the whole, however, the marvellous accuracy of citation throughout the book is one of its outstanding features. Nor is it out of place to congratulate the publishers and printers alike on the excellence of the paper and the clearness of the type.

To conclude, then, a very imperfect survey of a very remarkable book, Dr. Robertson has good reason to be proud of his achievement. He has projected and carried through an epoch-making Grammar on the most approved lines of modern historical research. He has suggested new and fruitful lines of investigation on many debatable points. He has provided advanced students in theological schools, teachers, and scholarly pastors, all of whom he had in view when he wrote, with an invaluable aid in their efforts to acquaint themselves more thoroughly with their Greek New Testament. And while insisting on the necessity of interpreting the earthly forms and moulds in which its several books have been transmitted to us, according to the strict rules of language and grammar, he has never lost sight of the 'treasure,' which constitutes the crowning glory of these books. As he himself writes in bringing his work to a close: 'Grammar is nothing unless it reveals the thought and emotion hidden in language. It is just because Jesus is greater than Socrates and Plato and all the Greek thinkers and poets that we care so much what Luke and Paul and John have to tell about Him. . . . No toil is too great if by means of it men are enabled to understand more exactly the mind of Christ' (pp. 1207 f.).

Henry Scott.

By the Reverend W. F. Howard, M.A., B.D., Tutor in New Testament Language and Literature, Handsworth College, Birmingham.

The prominence given to this name in the third edition of Dr. Robertson's *Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, recalls the tribute which the late Dr. J. H. Moulton paid to him in the second edition of his *Prolegomena*: 'My special thanks are due to Mr. H. Scott, of Oxton, Birkenhead, who went over the index of texts and two or three complicated numerical computations in the body of the book, and sent me unsolicited some corrections and additions, for which the reader will add his gratitude to mine.'

How largely Professors Moulton and Robertson were indebted to this modest student for his minute care in checking figures and compiling statistics may be gathered from the tables which Dr. Robertson furnishes as an appendix to his third edition, duplicates of which had previously been sent to Dr. Moulton for use in his Grammar.

It was the privilege of the writer to know this remarkable man for some time by correspondence, and during the last year of his life in warm personal friendship. A short account of him may prove interesting to the readers of The Expository Times.

Henry Scott was born not far from Wolverhampton in 1843. When seven years old he came to live at Oxton, then a village near to Birkenhead, and went to a private school of which the Rev. Dr. Wall was master. He showed in his boyhood a great aptitude for Greek, but entered upon a business career and finally became the managing director of a well-known shipping firm in Liverpool. So great was his love of the Greek Testament that he regularly rose at five every morning, and put in some hours' study before business. The same zeal secured some time every evening for further work in the same field. Although he had other interests, such as gardening and chess, he described himself as *homo unius libri*. The Greek Bible and especially the New Testament claimed nearly all his leisure hours. Beginning with Buttmann and with Moulton's Winer he worked his way through every verse of the New Testament and noted every grammatical peculiarity. As far back as the year 1885 he began and carried through a MS. Grammar of the Greek Testament in several large volumes. Long before Dr. Moulton showed in his *Prolegomena* the need for a new Grammar based upon the later researches in comparative philology, Mr. Scott had worked his way through Brugmann and Delbrück's *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, applying the results to the problems of word-formation, accidence, and syntax in the Greek Testament. Although not a university man, and not a Greek scholar in the technical sense of the word, nothing seemed to escape his interest if it had any bearing upon his favourite study. While his son, Mr. Cyril Scott, the well-known composer, was living in Germany for his musical training, Mr. Scott visited that country and bought such books as Thumb's *Hellenismus*, then only just published and scarcely known to most British students. It is pretty safe to venture the statement that nowhere else in this country would it be possible to go into the study of an unprofessional layman and find such a library as his. *Kühner-Blass* and *Kühner-Gerth* were there, Hatzidakis' *Neugriechische Grammatik*, Hirt's *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, and many more. Nor were the less purely linguistic sides of N.T. study ignored. He was evidently in close touch with the best literature on the Synoptic Problem, and Von Soden's four large volumes on the text of the N.T. were conspicuous on his shelves. The remarkable thing is not so much that a Liverpool business man found time to study such books, as that he applied himself to the bearing of all that he read upon the grammar of the Greek Testament. Every line on every page of Moulton, Radermacher, Thackeray, Blass, Robertson, to name no others, was carefully read and tested, and he probably had a minute index of every technical book he read. How highly Dr. Robertson valued his assistance is indicated in a letter which says: 'Nobody has helped me as much as you. I am continually amazed at the wealth of your knowledge of the Greek N.T.' This is no slight praise from the author of the monumental Grammar. Yet so modest and reticent was this learned student that even his own vicar

had no suspicion of his parishioner's interest in Greek until he visited him during that illness which ended fatally on June 20, 1919. A devout and loyal member of the Church of England, he found spiritual support in her services, but turned with continual eagerness to the written word. It was a deep disappointment to him that Professor Moulton delayed the completion of his *Grammar*. He mourned his loss with deep regret, and left all his own MS. notes on N.T. Greek to the editor of Moulton's *Grammar* to assist in its completion. Mr. Henry Scott should ever be an inspiration to the unprofessional student of the Greek Bible.

Entre Nous.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

Self-consciousness.

1. To be conscious of ourselves, to know how we stand in relation to other selves and to the outer world is of the utmost value to us. Indeed, 'coming to self-consciousness' is the technical expression used by certain philosophers to mean the highest point to which human thought can attain. Yet the very expression 'self-consciousness' is sometimes used to indicate a quite unwholesome state of mind. A person who in a drawing-room is said to be self-conscious is one who thinks too much about himself and about what other people think of him. It is self-consciousness carried to excess and amounts to a disease. The introduction of consciousness into certain of our ordinary acts is often accompanied by a loss of power to do them as well as usual. Running down a long flight of steps is an easy matter if we think nothing about it, but if on the way we begin to consider what we are doing, we suddenly find ourselves in difficulties, and are quite apt to stumble. We often say that we cannot do certain things when there are a great many people looking on. The things are easy enough in themselves, and when we are by ourselves we do them without thinking much about them. But when we are aware that we are being watched we begin to think about how we are doing our work, and confusion follows.[1]

¶ A distinguished French psychologist, Gustave Le Bon, adopts as the motto of a book called *The Psychology of Education* the words, 'Education consists in causing the conscious to pass into the unconscious.'

2. In enumerating the elements of the preacher's power, Phillips Brooks puts 'next to the fundamental necessity of character' the freedom from self-consciousness. 'My mind,' he says, 'goes back to a young man whom I knew in the ministry, who did an amount of work at which men wondered, and who, dying early, left a power behind him whose influence will go on long after his name is forgotten; and the great feature of his character was his forgetfulness of self. He had not two questions to ask about every piece of work he did,—first, "How shall I do it most effectively for others?" and second, "How shall I do it most creditably to myself?" Only the first question ever seemed to come to him; and when a task was done so that it should most perfectly accomplish its designed result, he left it and went on to some new task. There is wonderful clearness and economy of force in such simplicity. No man ever yet thought whether he was preaching well without weakening his sermon. I think there are few higher or more delightful moments in a preacher's life than that which comes sometimes when, standing before a congregation and haunted by questionings about the merit of your preaching, which you hate but cannot drive away, at last, suddenly or gradually, you find yourself taken into the power of your truth, absorbed in one sole desire to send it into the men whom you are preaching to; and then every sail is set, and your sermon goes bravely out to sea, leaving yourself high and dry upon the beach, where it has been holding your sermon stranded. The second question disappears out of your work just in proportion as the first question grows intense. No man is perfectly strong until the second question has disappeared entirely. Devotion is like the candle which, as Vasari tells us, Michael Angelo used to carry stuck on his forehead in a pasteboard cap and which kept his own shadow from being

[1] J. Adams, *The Student's Guide*, 10.

cast upon his work while he was hewing out his statues.'[1]

¶ 'Lord Houghton,' says Mr. Brodrick, 'was most kind to me, as he was to so many younger men, and I once stayed with him at Fryston, but I never was among his special *protégés* or favourites. His insatiable curiosity and perfectly natural desire to know every one worth knowing, added to no ordinary accomplishments and poetical gifts of a high order, made him a personage in English society, and his memory is still cherished with gratitude. But he fell short of the greatness to which perhaps he once aspired, and his failure to attain it is partly explained by the humorous reason which he is said to have given for his doubtful success in the House of Commons, viz., that he could not help saying to himself in the midst of his speeches, "Well, Dicky, how are you getting on?" Probably many other aspirants to fame, if equally candid, would make the same confession.'[2]

3. It is self-consciousness that is the chief cause of mannerism. Cardinal Manning simply identifies them. 'I have had a horror of mannerism, or self-consciousness, which I feel to detect in men by an instinct. It gives me gooseflesh. I heard a sermon lately in which the thoughts were as three, the words as six, and the gestures as nine. And yet the man was a good man, but he had been "taught to preach."'[3]

¶ Bishop Phillips Brooks was himself singularly free from self-consciousness. Viscount Bryce compares his manner with that of other great preachers —Wilberforce, Candlish, Spurgeon, Liddon, Beecher. 'All these famous men were, in a sense, more brilliant, that is to say, more rhetorically effective, than Dr. Brooks, yet none of them seemed to speak so directly to the soul. With all of them it was impossible to forget the speaker in the words spoken, because the speaker did not seem to have quite forgotten himself, but to have studied the effect he sought to produce. With him it was otherwise. What amount of preparation he may have given to his discourses I do not know. But there was no sign of art about them, no touch of self-consciousness. He spoke to his audience as a man might speak to his friend, pouring forth with swift, yet quiet and seldom impassioned, earnestness the thoughts and feelings of a singularly pure and lofty spirit. The listeners never thought of style or manner, but only of the substance of the thoughts. They were entranced and carried out of themselves by the strength and sweetness and beauty of the aspects of religious truth and its helpfulness to weak human nature which he presented. Dr. Brooks was the best, because the most edifying of preachers.'[4]

4. Nervousness is not self-consciousness. Nervousness is a condition of success. We have all a vivid remembrance of our first attempt to speak in public without MS. We can still recall the sudden blank in memory, the dry throat, the swimming head, the indistinct vision, the ardent desire for prompt and complete extinction. These are the heralds of future success. They indicate an excess of nerve-power—the power to impress an audience. No good speaker is free from nervousness. He loses with practice the excess, but to the last, as Martin Luther felt his knees knock together as he went up the steps of the pulpit, the preacher who reaches his people trembles as he faces them. Self-consciousness is very different. It is a subtle form of pride which crushes inspiration, begets affectation, and destroys naturalness. The self-conscious preacher is either haunted by a fear that he will make a fool of himself, or he strains after effect. In either case he ceases to be natural, and forfeits his right and power to be effective.[5]

¶ Of Archbishop Magee his wife says: 'He never thought of self; for though on going into the pulpit he was always nervous the first few minutes, he often said, "After a minute or two I forget that any one is present: my subject has such possession of me, I can think of nothing else." He never wanted to know if he preached well, but if it was a sermon that would do good to his hearers. He was ever anxious that what he said might be blessed to those who heard him.'[6]

5. What is the cure for self-consciousness? The sure and certain cure, says Bishop Chavasse is love—love to God and man. 'If we believe that we have a message to give, and that our message will help our hearers, we shall not think of ourselves. Self will be forgotten in the desire to benefit our people. And still more effectually self-consciousness is cured by God-consciousness. We are sent by God. We are His commissioned teachers. The Word we bear is not ours, but His; and He is with us. In the realization of our

[1] P. Brooks, *Lectures on Preaching*, 51.
[2] G. C. Brodrick, *Memories and Impressions*, 262.
[3] E. S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning*, ii. 725.
[4] A. V. G. Allen, *Phillips Brooks*, 581.
[5] Bishop F. J. Chavasse, in *On Sermon Preparation*, 130.
[6] J. C. MacDonnell, *The Life and Correspondence of William Conner Magee*, i. 53.

commission, and of His Divine Presence, self passes out of sight.'[1]

President Kern is more definite and detailed. The cure of self-consciousness is self-concentration upon three things.

(1) *On the subject.*—No matter what may have been the kind and amount of preparation given to the sermon,—whether without a single written or memorized word, or resulting in a full manuscript laid in the open Bible before you—the subject is *your* subject; you have it in hand *now*, and are concerned with none other whatsoever. Your thoughts will sometimes flit away, just as they would often play the vagrant in the preparation to preach. But let it be distinctly forbidden. Think your subject and no other.

(2) *On the audience.*—Even the writer cannot afford to be wholly occupied with his theme. In imagination he must see his composition under the eye of the reader, and must so write as to win the reader's attention and convey the desired influence to his mind. Said a poet in old age, writing to a friend concerning his latest book: 'I don't know of any reason I had for publishing it, save a yearning desire to speak to my friends once more.' If it be so with the writer, much more must the preacher in his study see his 'friends' in the congregation, and be talking with them. But, above all, the speaker, when actually before his audience, must be sensitively conscious of their presence.

(3) *On the object.*—The hearers of Dr. Nathaniel J. Burton would doubtless have said that he uniformly preached 'about something,' and that he did it with remarkable freshness and beauty of thought. But he himself has said: 'It has been the sin of my life that I have not always taken aim. I have been a lover of subjects. If I had loved men more and loved subjects only as God's instruments of good to men, it would have been better, and I should have more to show for all my labour under the sun.' Many men in the midst of their ministry are making the same mistake, with only a half-consciousness of it.[2]

¶ It is entirely possible to lose consciousness of self for the time in the theme or the occasion. Assuming that the preparatory work has been thorough, a man can train himself to fasten his thought entirely on his subject and his opportunity. If his theme is a worthy one and he has given adequate thought or research to it, he can learn to forget himself and his audience in complete surrender to it. Companionship with truth invests a man with a dignity which ought to give him poise and serenity; which will give him calmness and effectiveness if he regards himself as its servant and messenger. An ambassador is held in great honour because of the power he represents; a man who is dealing in any way with truth or beauty has a right to repose in the greatness and charm of that for which he stands. This transference of interest from the outcome of a personal effort to the sharing of a vision or the conveyance of a power has often made the stammerer eloquent and the timid spirit heroically indifferent to self. The true refuge of the artist is absorption in his art; the true refuge of the self-conscious worker is complete surrender to the dignity and interest of his work.[3]

[1] Bishop F. J. Chavasse, in *On Sermon Preparation*, 130.
[2] J. A. Kern, *The Ministry to the Congregation*, 506.
[3] H. W. Mabie, *Essays on Work and Culture*, 239.

SOME TOPICS.

Presbyterians and Unitarianism.

The History of the Church is likely to become a popular study with the rising generation. Their grandfathers went into the study of the Old Testament, their fathers into that of the New. The study of the Church is in the natural order of succession, and the problems which have arisen are those which concern it. Then will men like the Rev. B. Nightingale, M.A., Litt.D., come into their inheritance. Dr. Nightingale has written many books, most of them on Church History, all of them scholarly and reliable. His new book is a short history of the period *From the Great Awakening to the Evangelical Revival* (London: Memorial Hall).

Dr. Nightingale is able to explode some popular fallacies. This is one. 'It is of the utmost importance that we should be clear in reference to the significance of the Salters' Hall split. "The controversy," says Dr. Dale, "had grave consequences. It was the open sign of the great doctrinal rupture between the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists." That is the common historical view, but it is quite a mistaken one. Starting with this error, it is the custom of most writers on this subject to follow it with another equally serious, and contend that it was the so-called Presbyterian Churches that subsequently became Unitarian, whilst the Independent or Congregational Churches remained loyal to Evangelical truth. Dr. Dale again argues

quite warmly for this position; but it will not stand the test of serious examination.'

The Perfect Gentleman.

The Rev. W. B. Hughes, C.F., published some 'very plain talks to men' (these are his own words) under the title of *The Perfect Gentleman* (Skeffingtons; 3s. net). How shall we know the perfect gentleman when we see him? He is courteous—he does not thump a coin upon the counter and say, 'Packet o' Woodbines.' He is honourable—he will never 'do anybody down.' He is clean—General Grant was sitting in a room; a subaltern came in: 'I say, I have just heard a priceless story—no ladies present?' 'No,' said the General, 'but there are gentlemen present.' He is temperate—'It can't be manly to make a beast of yourself, and it isn't done—among gentlemen.'

The Purpose of the Church.

'There *is* an answer to the question what is the true aim of the Christian and the true purpose of the Church. Quite a simple answer, about the meaning of which no one need be in darkness or hesitation. That answer is that the aim of the Christian and the true purpose of the Church is *the Kingdom of Christ in this world.* This is the primary, and for the immediate time being, the one absolute aim of the Christian and purpose of the Church. It does not exclude other aims and purposes, but it makes them secondary. Unity, for example: many are saying that the aim of the Churches to-day should be unity. Unity is eminently desirable; but it will come only by putting first things first. The One Holy Catholic Church of Christ, the goal of the Christian's longing, desire and effort, cannot and will not emerge in truth and reality excepting in so far as it comes prepared and eager for the Lordship of Christ in this world, prepared and eager to revolutionize our social and industrial life into and under that Lordship. When Christ is truly present in the Church, this aim of revolutionizing the social order is open, manifest, and declared: when this aim is not apparent, then the Church is excluding her Lord. Not only so: the sundered parts of the Church will begin to come together in proportion as each part begins to display complete devotion to this primary ethical and social aim, and in proportion as the fire of consecrated enthusiasm for the Kingdom of Christ in this world grows and mounts and burns to the fusing of differences in the flame of unity in aim and ideal. We shall find the unity of the Church in the setting up of Christ's Kingdom in the world, and we shall not find it elsewhere; failure to serve and accomplish this aim is alone capable of finally destroying the Church: success alone can save it.'

The author is the Rev. Stanley A. Mellor, B.A., Ph.D. The quotation is from *Jesus Christ and Social Change* (Swarthmore Press; 3s. 6d. net), a book of which we can tell the purpose as simply and as surely as the author tells the purpose of the Church. It is to bring the men and women who see the need of 'something being done' to understand that one thing must be done—the morality taught by Christ must be put in practice, and that both Individually and Socially. Practise it, for it it is practicable.

The Liberty of Prophesying.

'We are no believers in leaving teachers "free"—to let loose crudenesses and ignorances on their pupils. The best teacher—and, as for that, the best preacher too—would be considerably better for having the leading facts and arguments of his subject supplied him. The mediocre or inferior teacher would be immeasurably better.' The author of that strong statement is F. H. Hayward, D.Lit., M.A., B.Sc., an innovator in all things. His great innovation is School Celebrations. He and Mr. Arnold Freeman published a book not long ago advocating the teaching of literature, morality, and even religion by means of anniversary and other celebrations, and they gave specimens. In this book, called *A First Book of School Celebrations* (P. S. King & Son; 5s. net), Dr. Hayward is alone, but Mr. Freeman is with him in spirit still. The book (after a most enjoyable and most revolutionary introduction) contains more specimen celebrations—a Celebration for Shakespeare Day, for League of Nations Day, for Democracy Day, for St. Paul's Day—those from the series entitled 'The Spiritual Foundations of Reconstruction.' Next, three Recital Celebrations—one on Bards and Seers, one on World Conquerors, one on The Samson Story. Then six Expository Celebrations, on Eugenics, on Temperance, and on Commerce. Lastly, two Anniversary Celebrations

(Summer and Flying) and two Memorial Celebrations (Chaucer and Spenser).

The idea has been ridiculed here and there, but open-eyed teachers like Professor Arthur Thomson and Mr. Kenneth Richmond have welcomed it. This is the method. The actors are not the children. They are Director (D), Speaker (S), Master or Mistress (M). Take St. Paul's Day. The whole school rises and sings 'For all the saints.' Passages from Mendelssohn's *St. Paul* are played. The Director recites from Carlyle 'Two men I honour and no third.' Then the Speaker, after some discourse about travellers and a quotation from *Othello*, reads the account from 2 Cor. 11 of St. Paul's travelling experiences, and speaks of his conversion, quotes Meyer's 'Whoso hath felt the Spirit of the Highest,' and touches on his teaching. Then the Director reads sentences from the Pauline Epistles bearing on life and conduct. The Celebration ends with the singing of Luther's hymn (in Carlyle's translation)—'A safe stronghold our God is still.'

A Theory of the Fall.

It is now often taken for granted that there was no Fall. The mythical language in which it is narrated is taken as proving that it is itself a myth. But the Rev. Peter Green, M.A., Canon of Manchester, believes in the Fall still. He has written a book on *The Problem of Evil* (Longmans; 6s. net). He cannot explain that problem without a Fall. But the Fall must be better understood than it has been. A theory of the Fall which will help to explain the problem of evil 'must (1) display sin as altogether man's fault; the revolt of a free spiritual being against his creator; and (2) it must be such as to establish a connection between man and the physical universe such that physical suffering may be seen to be the necessary outcome of moral evil. For then God may truly be incapable of putting an end to pain except by putting an end to sin, and incapable of putting an end to sin without destroying the very nature of man, as a free spirit, save by the long process of winning man back to Himself with infinite patience and long-suffering love. And (3) our theory of the Fall must supply some explanation of why the evolution of the world is one of strife and pain, and not the painless and easy growth of a healthy organism in which each part helps each, and all help all.'

Possessing Possessions.

The late Right Rev. H. C. G. Moule, D.D., Bishop of Durham, attended the Keswick Convention in 1919, and preached two sermons and delivered four addresses. These sermons and addresses have now been published with the title *Christ and the Christian* (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d.). Keswick never was better served or better advocated. In the very first sermon Dr. Moule quotes Murray McCheyne's summary of the Gospel, 'Christ for us is all our righteousness before a holy God; Christ in us is all our strength in an ungodly world'; and then says that that is the Gospel which Keswick stands for. A feature of Dr. Moule's addresses is their illustration. One of them has for its text Ob[17], 'Then shall they possess their possessions.' This illustration is used: 'I happen to know for certain the matters I am going to mention. Long years ago there was left a widow whose husband was a merchant in Manila; he died on a business voyage, and was buried by an uncle of mine, who was then chaplain at Singapore. My uncle came to know the widow *à propos* of the burial, and told me this story. The lady, the widow, was left in very straitened circumstances at Manila. They had a little landed property in Australia, and she wrote to a business friend there to dispose of every bit of the ground, if he could. He sold it all, except one little plot that seemed so barren, and was so much out of the way for building, that nobody would buy. Well, so it was at first. She still owned the useless little plot of ground, rather against her will. But in 1850, two years later, they found gold in Australia, and in that little good-for-nothing field was discovered a gold mine. It was not a large one, but it was a gold mine, and it was enough, by its proceeds, to lift anxiety off the widow's heart. She told the story to my uncle, who told it to me. And so she had her possession all the time; the gold was every ounce of it under the ground all the time; but till she realized that it was there it was exactly to her as if it had not been. At last she possessed her possession, as a glad discovery, and it made a great difference to her life.'

No Miracle, no God.

A reply to Professor Bethune-Baker's book on the Creed (reviewed in these pages some months ago) has been made by the Rev. A. J. C. Allen, M.A., sometime Fellow and Assistant Tutor of

Peterhouse, Cambridge. The title is *The Christ of the Future* (Scott; 2s. net). It is not an effective reply, but there are good sentences in it. This is well said: 'The reality of miracle flows from the reality of God. God works through the ordinary course of nature. He reveals Himself there day by day, but man could never grasp that fact if He had never revealed Himself in startling ways, what we call miracle. No miracle, no God, at any rate no God Who is in any real sense transcendent, is a truth that has always commended itself to the religious consciousness, and will go on doing so so long as that consciousness remains alive.'

POETRY.

George Adam Smith.

It is not generally known that Sir George Adam Smith is a writer of poetry. For he has not written much or made it known. Gifted as he is with a prose style more exquisite than most of our professional literary men, it does not follow that he is possessor also of that indefinable, though much defined, thing called the poetic gift. Read the poem which Mrs. and Professor Alexander Lawson have included in their selection of the poetry of Scotland—*A St. Andrews Treasury of Scottish Verse* (A. & C. Black; 7s. 6d. net). The title is 'Old Aberdeen,' and the date October 1915:

Mother of trees and towers and ancient ways,
  And homes of studious peace; to whose grey Crown
Thy lads come up through these October days,
  Come up again the while thy leaves fall down—
Rustling about the young and eager feet
  As if the spirits of thy crowded past,
Mustering on high those latest ranks to greet,
  Did down their ghostly salutations cast—

Ah, this October many come no more
  Whose trysted faces we had looked to see;
For on the fields of Flanders or that shore
  Steep and fire-swept of grim Gallipoli
They fell like leaves, innumerably fell,
  And tho' still quick and keen and fain for life,
With as ripe ease and gentleness of will,
  As the sere leaf from out the tempest's strife—
Ready for Death and their young sacrifice
  By faith in God, by love of home and land,
And the proud conscience of the ungrudged price
  Their fathers paid at Freedom's high demand.

Though through thy stripped trees, trailing with the mist,
  The mournful music of the pipes comes creeping,
Mourn not for those who only failed thy tryst
  Because they kept a holier—and are keeping.

Mrs. and Professor Lawson (we follow the order on the title-page) have dared comparison with two selections of Scottish poetry which were published very like one another in appearance (both in blue cloth with gilt borders after the manner of Quiller-Couch's English book) and very near to one another in time (one in 1910, the other in 1911)—Mr. Macneile Dixon's *Edinburgh Book of Scottish Verse*, and Sir George Douglas's *Book of Scottish Poetry*. They follow the chronological arrangement of both those books; their advantage over both being that they are later. And being later means that they profit by the criticism passed upon those books and that they have a few poets and a good many poems to select from of the last ten years. Neither Mr. Dixon nor Sir George Douglas had the name of Mary Symon, for example, in the list of authors: Mrs. and Professor Lawson give us two poems by that true and truly Scottish poet.

One is 'After Neuve Chapelle.' This is the first verse:

We'd a hefty second horseman, fae the braes on Deveronside,
An' twa bit college birkies like to burst their breeks wi' pride;
There was Lauchin' Tam an' 'Curly' an' the ane we ca'ed 'The Loon,'
Wi' his sowf an' pech an' fosel, fit to wreck the hale platoon.
An' they're a' deid or deein'—I've a gey bit clour mysel'—
But I winner fat they're thinkin' i' the Glen o' Neuve Chapelle.

Claude L. Penrose.

Claude Quayle Lewis Penrose was born in 1893 in Florida, but lived most of his life in England. He was a precocious child. 'Once when he was

four years old, seeing a likelihood that some forbidden adventure was about to be discussed, he made an adroit attempt to turn the conversation into safe scientific channels with his never-forgotten suggestion: "Let's talk about evolution."

'A little later came the inevitable outcome of too much attention. Mr. Arnold Bennett had arrived to spend the week-end. Lunch was in progress, when suddenly a bomb was dropped: "Mr. Bennett, do you know my daddy said a most horrid thing about you before you came?" Dead silence—suspended breath—then: "He said he was sick of the sound of your name!"'

But he outgrew all the terror and retained all the charm, pleasing everybody by his unselfishness and sympathy. When war broke out he was already a professional soldier and went. He believed and others believed that he carried a charmed life. But on the last day of July in 1918 'he was in his B.C. post with one of his subalterns when the post was hit in the only spot on which it was possible for a shell to take effect.' Next day in hospital he died. He was buried at Esquelbecq.

And now a most handsome and luxurious volume has been published to his memory. Its title is *Poems*, by Claude L. Penrose (Harrison & Sons), for it contains his poems together with a long biographical preface. We have already quoted from the preface, let us now quote one of the poems:

THE GOAL.

Let us not think, 'What lies beyond the end?'
  Lest we should faint and fail and turn aside,
Dizzy and tremulous as men who bend
  Over some high rock, cleft agape and wide,
  And hear below the lap of rising tide.

My soul all weary with strange wayfaring,
  (What I have grasped is far from my desire)
I press along, still straitly following
  The cloud of smoke by day, by night of fire.
  I know my goal; my seeking shall not tire.

Nicol Macnicol.

To the 'Heritage of India' Series, Dr. Nicol Macnicol has contributed a volume entitled *Psalms of Marāthā Saints* (Oxford University Press; 2s. net). Take this short psalm with the title of 'The Besetting God':

Of God my meat and drink I make,
  God is the bed on which I lie.
God is whate'er I give or take;
  God's constant fellowship have I
For God is here and God is there,—
  No place that empty is of him.
Yea, lady Vithā, I declare,
  I fill the world up to the brim.

The God of the Marāthā saint is Vithoba, and he can be worshipped in a female form, the lady Vithā. But what is 'I fill the world up to the brim'? It is the very heart of the Marāthā creed. The lines, all but the last, express a feeling that has all the appearance of being parallel to that daily comradeship with Christ which Christian saints have ever sought, but the last line shows that 'the psalm is no more than a metaphysical affirmation of identity with the All.' In his valuable Introduction Dr. Macnicol compares the Marāthā with the Hebrew Psalms. The difference goes deep down. It is the difference between morality and insensibility.

Eva Martin.

If we had poems to publish we should send them to Messrs. Philip Allan in Chancery Lane. For having published Eva Martin's so irresistibly (the white page bordered by light blue and the initial letters like miniature pictures), they will be able to publish other volumes as attractively. The poems in this case are worth it. Take this example. The subject is itself poetical and it is expressed poetically:

When we must die—we two who captured love,
And dwell with him while yet we tread the
  earth—
Forsake me not in that far, strange re-birth,
But let our climbing souls together move.

Let there be no dark thought to part us then,
No faint desire to draw our steps astray,
No dim and secret memory shut away
In either heart, hid from the other's ken.

Let our untrammelled spirits merge and meet
Where fire divine melts mortal locks and bars,
And climb the white road laid among the stars
In comradeship grown perfect and complete.

But if fate wills that one of us shall find
The pace too quick, the starry path too steep,
Let it be mine to linger and to weep—
I could not live if thou wert left behind!

Better for me to fall beside the way,
To tire and faint, to perish in the dark,
Than to be swept to heaven, a soaring spark,
And know thee lost in spaces vast and grey.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Is the thought of our day passing from Christ to God? Canon J. M. WILSON thinks it is. Before the War men asked to see Jesus: now they ask to see God. He quotes the saying of a soldier in hospital: 'I'm a *Christian* all right, Padre; it's what the parsons say about *God* that stumps me.'

But Canon WILSON does not therefore leave Christ on one side. In the Cathedral at Worcester he has preached a series of ten sermons about God. But he knows that he cannot preach about God without preaching about Christ. For it is not some philosophical conception of God that he preaches, nor even some theological conception, it is the conception which Christ has given. And so, when he came to publish his sermons he gave them this title: *Christ's Thought of God* (Macmillan; 5s. net).

Now the special thought of God which Canon WILSON finds in Christ is an unexpected thought. And he finds it in an unexpected text.

The text is Lk 22^{69}. In the Authorized Version it reads: 'Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God.' But Canon WILSON will not have that version. The opening phrase cannot mean 'hereafter.' The Greek is absolutely clear and can only mean, as the Revisers have it, 'from henceforth.' Again the title 'Son of man' is not, he says, a title here of Christ. It signifies mankind. And finally to sit on the right hand (or as the Revisers translate, 'be seated at the right hand') of the power of God means to be within reach of God's power so as to be able to use it. Now we do not need to ascend to heaven in order to be within reach of God's power, it is enough that God comes down to us.

Jesus made a new revelation of God that day. And it was like Him to make it to Caiaphas. What Caiaphas might take out of it at the moment we do not know. But it would stay with him beyond the moment, to make him think. What was the revelation?

It was the revelation of the fact that from that moment mankind would cease to look upon God as dwelling at a distance. From that moment, and henceforth through all time, God would be known to be present with men, both with them and in them. In the enjoyment of His presence in their hearts and lives men would be in harmony with the will of God and able to use His power as they endeavoured to make His will prevail in the world. To be seated at the right hand of God is to be in harmony with Him in all His purposes. In the language of St. Paul it is to have Christ dwelling in the heart by faith. In the language of St. John it is for men so to love God that He will

love them and will come unto them and make His abode with them. Henceforth, said Jesus, as Canon WILSON interprets Him, men like Caiaphas will with their own astonished eyes see mankind living in the love of God and so using the power of God that they will be able to say, 'We can do all things.' It is that word of warning to Caiaphas which was afterwards a word of encouragement to the disciples—'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'

If it is Evolution that has brought us into the present difficulty about the Supernatural, it is Evolution that will take us out again. That there is a way out no one need doubt. Not even Canon Sanday, with his incomparable singleness of heart and seductiveness of language, can persuade us that all the miracles of the New Testament are capable of being 'explained.' It is not the consequence of their explanation that we fear. God will look after consequences. Our objection to the explanatory method is that it does not explain.

Evolution will show us the way out. The present Bishop of Bloemfontein, Dr. Arthur CHANDLER, is one of the keenest and sanest thinkers of our day. He has already written three or four books. In every one of them he is in touch with modern thought, in every one he provokes further thought in his readers. To his latest book he gives the title of *Scala Mundi* (Methuen; 4s. 6d. net). In that book Dr. CHANDLER shows how Evolution is able to rescue us from the present difficulty about the Supernatural.

The difficulty is due to Science. Scientific observers say that the Universe is under the sway of laws which are inviolable. Their value lies in their inviolability. If we cannot depend upon them they are useless. To say that they are subject to 'interference' is to say that they are not laws. If a law of nature like gravitation can be suspended at the incalculable will of some superior Power, it is no longer a law of nature. That is the scientific position.

It is a scientific difficulty. And it is immediately due to Evolution. For Evolution eliminates 'interference.' To all outsiders it says, Hands off. The power to evolve is there, and it will work its own salvation. The whole evolution theory is understood to rest upon the absolute sway of natural law. If the Christian believer feels that Christianity stands or falls with the Supernatural, the believer in Evolution is confident that the acceptance of miracle will be the end of Evolution.

The BISHOP OF BLOEMFONTEIN is a believer in Evolution. If he differs from any other evolutionist it is only in the whole-heartedness of his belief. It is his whole-hearted belief in it that makes him insist upon Evolution being carried all the way. Is Evolution true in the sphere of inorganic matter? It is true also in the sphere of organic life. It is true in the sphere of human personality. It is true in the sphere of life (supposing there is such life) that is both human and divine.

Dr. CHANDLER gives Evolution full scope and exercise in the sphere of inorganic matter. But he asks of the evolutionist what right he has to confine it to inorganic matter. He demands not less but more in the sway of law than the physical evolutionist. And he has a right to demand it. He demands the application of law, that is, of regular reliable order, to every department of life and being. You insist upon the rigid rule within the inorganic kingdom? he says to the evolutionist. Carry it further. The inorganic world is not the only world. The way to higher worlds is open and continuous. Forward and fear not.

The physical evolutionist says that law has absolute authority within the physical sphere. But the physical sphere is not a closed system—except to the materialist, and there are few materialists now. Pass into the next sphere. It is the sphere

of animal life and behaviour. It is equally subject to law. Its laws are not the same as in the mechanical sphere. They are modified by the advent of that new fact called Life. But they are laws. More difficult to discover, when discovered they are as reliable as mechanical laws.

Pass on again. What right has any evolutionist to close the reign of law at the animal stage? The next sphere is the human. Again there is unfaltering obedience to law, when it is discovered. It is not mechanical law, and it is not animal law alone; it includes both; but the introduction of conscience gives it more complexity as well as more importance.

Pass on once more. What right has any evolutionist to close the evolutionary system with the advent of man? Though we have nearly reached the limit of our conceptions, we are still able to conceive one higher sphere. It is the sphere of the human and divine. If God becomes man and dwells among us, there is a new system in this world. And the new system will be amenable to law not less surely than any of the old systems.

If then, says the Bishop of Bloemfontein, 'in the case of Jesus Christ we recognize a new and higher grade of existence, we shall naturally expect His actions to express that higher life, and to differ from our own in their motives and scope and power. The last point, the power of these actions, is the one we want to deal with now.'

'It brings us face to face with the "miracles" of Christ. And in this connexion the first point to get clear about is, that we do not regard these miracles as "exceptions to the laws of nature"—a perfectly idiotic and preposterous idea which Christians are sometimes supposed to entertain. It is simply impossible to believe in a thing as an exception to something else; if we believe in it, we believe in it as an outcome of some power adequate to produce it. And we simply apply to the actions of Christ a principle of universal application, namely, that within the universe of truth there are different levels of being, that at each higher level a fresh power emerges and operates, and that in each case the new actions are of a sort which would be abnormal or miraculous on the levels below.'

'Thus it is natural for a cabbage, which has organic life, to grow and expand in a manner which would be miraculous in the case of a stone or a star, which latter are subject simply to chemical and physical laws. It is, again, natural for a man, who possesses personal conscious life, to form a system of knowledge and a scheme of life, which would be miraculous in lower organisms, vegetable or animal, subject to the laws of physiology. And so, lastly, it is natural for Christ, who has the nature of God Incarnate, to exercise powers which would be miraculous for men limited in their actions by the laws of psychology.'

'And in every case, the phenomena which would be miraculous on the lower level, become natural on the higher, just because on that level there exists a power adequate to their production. When a new power has emerged, it is absurd to cavil at the new ways in which it manifests itself; absurd to deny that a dog can grow and move, because a flint can do neither; absurd to deny that a man can talk, and choose between right and wrong, because a dog can do neither; absurd to deny that Christ could multiply loaves or walk on the sea, because we can do neither. Each higher power, as it comes forth, manifests itself in ways which are natural and normal for it, however abnormal or miraculous they would be in spheres below.'

'It would seem, then, that the term "miraculous" is a relative term, applied from below to describe an output of power which cannot be expected there, because there is no cause capable of producing it on that particular level. A perambulating cabbage, or a calculating pig, would be freakish, abnormal, miraculous, whilst at

the same time perambulation is natural for a pig and calculation for a man. Thus Christ's mighty works are miracles from our point of view, whilst being at the same time natural and normal exhibitions, "signs," as St. John calls them, of a power present in Him and not in us.'

'And in all these actions there is no unwarrantable incursion of an alien power, upsetting and confounding an orderly system of natural law: that is the old fallacy of the closed system. Rather such action is an indication and an outcome of a fact of supreme importance, namely, that the universe is spiritual from end to end; that it awakes to its true nature in God; and that, equally in its ordinary modes of action and in those which we call miraculous, it is the spiritual will of God which is its creative and sustaining and ruling power. Since the whole development leads up to God, and finds its meaning and explanation there, we must read God's will backwards into all the lower spheres, with the result that the whole universe will be spiritual in ultimate character, dominated and permeated by that which is its one true life.'

'Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus.' 'To the saints which are at Ephesus'—who would they be? Where would the post-runner find them? If Paul had sent a letter to London, Edinburgh, Dublin with this address? 'To the saints which are in Edinburgh,' who would claim it?

Not we. Certainly not. We do not lay claim to so much goodness as that. We will let no one challenge our moral life. But we do not quite set up to be saints. Wordsworth's ideal woman—

> A creature not too bright or good
> For human nature's daily food—

is enough for us. To the saints? No saints in Edinburgh, try Aberdeen.

But we are making a mistake. That is not what 'saint' means. It has no reference to goodness, much or little. We refuse the letter addressed to the saints because we are not good enough. But Paul did not call the company in Ephesus who received the letter 'saints' because they were good. In point of fact they were not good, not so good, it is to be hoped, as we are. And yet he had no hesitation in calling them saints.

There are three words which we have to understand. 'Saints' is one of them. The other two are 'sinners' and 'righteous.' When Jesus began His ministry He found the people divided into 'the sinners' (οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί) and 'the righteous' (οἱ δίκαιοι). The sinners knew that they were wrong. The righteous believed that they were right. Jesus showed the righteous that they also were wrong. He accepted what they did for what it was worth, but it was not worth much. They were trying to do right without being right. In various ways He showed them that that was all a mistake.

One way was by parables. He told the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. The publican was wrong and knew it: 'God be merciful to me the sinner.' The pharisee was wrong also, but did not know it: 'God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are.' And after the prayer, after the repentance, 'the *sinner* went down to his house justified rather than the other.'

He told the Parable of the Prodigal Son. That parable shows us the two classes clearly. The younger son is one of 'the sinners,' the elder is one of 'the righteous.' The sinner does wrong and comes to know it. His righteous brother is wrong and does not see it. But we see it. We see with quite astonishing clearness that though he has served his father 'these many years' and 'never has transgressed a commandment,' yet he is all wrong.

He is not at one with his father, and never has been. He has been a servant, not a son. It all

comes out when the younger son returns. The father welcomes him, the brother resents the welcome. He has no joy at his brother's return, as he had probably no sorrow at his departure: 'He has made his bed, let him lie on't.' The father loves the prodigal, has loved him all along and looked for his return. The elder son has no love for either brother or father. To do right he must be right, and to be right he must be right with his father.

The father is God. The sinners and the righteous are both out of harmony with God. They do not see things as God sees them, and therefore they do not do things as God would do them. But there is a difference. It is quite startling to find Christ setting the sinners before the righteous, as He does. But the reason is that the spirit of the sinners was often right though their deeds were wrong, while the deeds of the righteous were often right though their spirit was wrong. And it is worse to be wrong in spirit than in deed.

Jesus made this clear in the Parable of the Two Sons. The father came to one of the sons and said, Go, work in my vineyard. He said, I go, sir; but went not. He came to the other. He refused to go, but went. The one was outwardly obedient but inwardly rebellious. The other was outwardly rebellious but inwardly obedient. It was the inwardly obedient son that did the will of his father.

Now when Jesus dealt with these two classes, He dealt with them both alike. To both He said that they must begin again. In the case of the sinners that was comparatively easy, for all that they had to do was to repent of their sinfulness. In the case of the righteous it was very difficult. For them also, however, there was nothing else for it; they must begin again. They must get right with God first. Then they would be able to do right.

How were they to get right with God? Jesus explained very simply, Paul very elaborately. Jesus said, Follow me. He was at one with God. 'I and the Father are one.' 'I do always that which pleases him.' To be at one with Jesus was to be at one with God. He called this oneness Love. 'If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him.' To be right with God was to love the Lord Jesus Christ.

So said Paul also. But he had a most elaborate story to tell of the way by which a man is brought to love the Lord. It is the story of the at-one-ment. As soon as we use the word we spell it with a capital letter and are occupied with the doctrine of the Atonement. And why not? This *is* the way of becoming right with God. Jesus *has* to die on the Cross. We have to die with Him. Jesus has to rise again from the dead. We have to rise in Him. It is elaborate, but it is all true and verifiable in experience. Paul has not gone one step astray from the Master. His 'I am crucified with Christ' is just the theology of 'Come, take up your cross, and follow me.'

What are we to call them when they follow? We need a new name. 'The sinners' (οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί) will not do. 'The righteous' (οἱ δίκαιοι) will not do. We will call them 'the saints'; that is, the holy ones (οἱ ἅγιοι). It is a good name, for the point of it is that they are one with God, who is the Holy One.

Yes, the saints are those who are right with God. They are not those who have done right. They may not yet have done one truly right thing. In any case, it is not because they have done right that they are called saints. It is because they *are* right.

How Paul insists upon it! He insists upon it so determinedly that we have had to coin a word to distinguish the fact of being right from the fact of doing right. The one we have called Justification, the other Sanctification. And no one can read the Pauline Epistles—no scholar does read them

now—without perceiving that when Paul says a man is justified he does not mean that he is doing right, he means that he *is* right.

Now it is possible for a man to be called a saint though he is not a saint. How are we to know that a man is right with God? By his deeds. If he is right, he will do right. Justification is not sanctification; but if justification is not followed by sanctification, it is not justification. What is the difference then between the righteous and the saints? How can we tell that the righteous are not saints, and the saints not simply righteous? By the kind of deeds they do.

Christina Rossetti will tell us:

I saw a Saint.—How canst thou tell that he
  Thou sawest was a Saint?—
I saw one like to Christ so luminously
  By patient deeds of love, his mortal taint
Seemed made his groundwork for humility.

And when he marked me downcast utterly
  Where foul I sat and faint,
Then more than ever Christ-like kindled he;
  And welcomed me as I had been a saint,
Tenderly stooping low to comfort me.

Christ bade him, 'Do thou likewise.' Wherefore he
  Waxed zealous to acquaint
His soul with sin and sorrow, if so be
  He might retrieve some latent saint:—
'Lo, I, with the child God hath given to me!'

Two things are characteristic of the saint, two classes of deeds—likeness to Christ (who went about doing good), and the discovery of other saints. The 'righteous' are never luminously like Christ, and they have no skill in the discovery of saints. Christina Rossetti might have been expounding the Parable of the Prodigal Son. The elder brother was most unlike the father, and he had no eyes for the saintship—the latent saintship—of his younger brother.

Still it must be admitted that it is not always easy, and perhaps it is not always possible for men, to distinguish the saints from the righteous. It may be that the tares will remain among the wheat undetected even by the servants of the Husbandman. It may be that this one and that will enter into the marriage feast without the wedding-garment. But the detection is at the last inevitable. 'Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding-garment?' And he was speechless. His good deeds had been the doing of his duty. Until this moment he expected the credit due to them. But now he is speechless. 'Then the king said to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and cast him out into the outer darkness; there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth. For many are called, but few chosen.'

Is it possible for a man who has once been set right with God to go wrong again? The question has an old world flavour about it. We do not ask these questions now. There is a doctrine called the Perseverance of the Saints. It has been tossed to and fro among the theologians; it has got tattered and torn. We are not greatly concerned now about the Perseverance of the Saints.

But the question has a practical interest. There is a real human value in it. As theology, as the Perseverance of the Saints, it may be worn out and worthless. But as the most unmistakable test of the life we are living, its worth can scarcely be overestimated.

For there is a practical test by which a man may know if after he has been set right with God he may go wrong again. It is the test of forgiveness. The way by which a man is made one with God is by being forgiven. The way by which he may lose his fellowship is by refusing to forgive.

We have it best in one of the parables. It is the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant. He owed

his master a debt, a monstrous debt. Dr. SWETE estimates it at two million and four hundred thousand pounds. When he begged for time (which plainly would have been of little use to him) he was forgiven. He asked for forbearance; he obtained forgiveness. That is God's way with sinners. The debt is immeasurable. As long as the sinner is sinning God is long-suffering; the moment he repents God forgives him. That is the Gospel.

The servant was set right with his master. What did he do then? He went out and met a fellow-servant, who owed him the miserable sum of three pound nineteen and twopence. He refused to forgive him; he refused to give him time to pay; he seized him by the throat and thrust him into prison. And when the master of these servants heard of it he cancelled the forgiveness, and not only sent the unforgiving servant to prison, which was hopeless enough, but delivered him to the tormentors — the 'hard labour' of our day — so that, as our Lord expressed it on another occasion, the last state of that man was worse than the first.

But does the parable apply to the sinner? Dr. SWETE has no doubt of it. We are referring to his newly issued book on *The Parables of the Kingdom* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). 'Must we not say'—these are Dr. SWETE's words—'that the act of the King who cancels his own pardon belongs only to the imagery of the parable, and not to the innermost truth of things? But our Lord's own words which follow the parable seem intended to guard against this view: "So also" as this King did, "so also shall my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye forgive not every one his brother from your hearts."'

So then, a man may fall from grace—has fallen from grace—if he refuses to forgive some other man. Could a simpler test be thought of? Could a severer? How many of us can forgive? In the April issue of *The Harvard Theological Review* there is an article by Professor G. H. PALMER on the Lord's Prayer. Professor PALMER has difficulty with one of the petitions of the Prayer. It is the petition about forgiveness. He sees that there also God's forgiveness is conditional on our forgiveness. And it is so hard to forgive. 'For forgiveness goes against our natural instincts and its very possibility may be doubted.'

Professor SWETE does not doubt its possibility. And yet he sees, as clearly as Professor PALMER, that forgiveness is not a light thing. It is not enough to say we forgive. It is sheer futility to say we may forgive but cannot forget. Forgiveness must be from the heart: 'So also shall my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye forgive not every one his brother *from your hearts*.'

And yet, hard as it is, and harder as that condition makes it, we have only to consider a moment to see that it must be so. God is a forgiving God—Can you utter a surer word about Him? If a man is unforgiving, how can he be in harmony with God? Look at the Parable of the Prodigal Son. What was wrong with the elder son was that he was out of sympathy with his father. How did he show that he was out of sympathy? By refusing to forgive his brother.

But after all——. Now there is nothing more dangerous than to add a 'but after all' to the demands of Christ. Yet Dr. SWETE does it. But after all, he says, 'there are circumstances in which it is not only permissible, but a duty to prosecute and to punish. Only, in such cases the prosecutor or person who punishes must make it a matter of conscience to ascertain that he is not actuated by a vindictive or an unforgiving spirit. It is the animus of the servant in the parable which is forbidden, not the simple recovery of a debt. In the same way, the parable does not require in private life the resumption of intimate relations with a person who has shewn himself unworthy of them. There may be full *ex animo* forgiveness of a wrong, and no personal sense

whatever of soreness or ill-will towards the offender, and yet common sense and the desire to avoid future occasion of friction may dictate a policy of aloofness for the time to come. As long as the Kingdom of Heaven is among men on earth, such limitations to human fellowship are inevitable, and the effort to ignore them is utopian; but it is always possible for the true subjects of the Kingdom to forgive from their hearts even those with whom they cannot freely associate. God does not ask impossibility from His servants; the Christian rule is well given by St. Paul: "If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, be at peace with all men"; and again, with special reference to fellow-members of the Church: "Forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you."

Job, Ecclesiastes, and a New Babylonian Literary Fragment.

By G. Buchanan Gray, D.Litt., D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Mansfield College, Oxford.

A Babylonian text of considerable interest for students of the Old Testament has recently been published.[1] Ebeling, the editor of the text, draws attention to the parallelism, in respect both of form and contents, which it presents with the work of the Hebrew pessimist, the author of Ecclesiastes; but, although he describes the new text as a specimen of a class of literature hitherto undiscovered in Babylonia, viz. that of the philosophical dialogue, he does not comment on the parallelism in form which, in so far as the description is correct, it presents with the Book of Job. Slight as is its resemblance to Job, it is yet sufficient to deserve attention; and, after giving a translation of a part of the new text, I will return to consider its significance in connexion with Job.

The text is contained on two tablets in the Berlin Museum, and a small fragment in London. The two Berlin tablets overlap, so that for parts of the text there are two witnesses. On the other hand, the beginning of the dialogue is so far undiscovered, and in other parts the tablets are broken, and the text defective. As my purpose is merely to draw attention to the parallelism with Hebrew literary forms, and as that purpose will be sufficiently served by a translation of part of the Babylonian work, I give here a translation only of the last half (according to Ebeling's arrangement), which, except in one or two lines, is free from mutilation, whereas the first half is much more mutilated and uncertain. For the present purpose, too, it is unnecessary to dwell in detail on the uncertainties or ambiguities in the translation which are dealt with in at least a preliminary way by Ebeling. The translation here given is mainly from Ebeling's German version, modified here and there by reference to the original text. In due time, no doubt, we may look for an English translation of the whole by a competent Assyriologist; and that, perhaps, not only of the fragments so far recovered, but of others which may still be lurking in London, and merely, as Ebeling suggests, awaiting fresh search to be discovered.

The dialogue consists of a serious of sections, each section closely adhering to the same scheme. The sections that occur on both the Berlin tablets are not arranged in the same order in both; nor in the different texts is the line division always identical. But the sections are separated from one another by horizontal lines. I number the sections according to the enumeration of Ebeling's translation.

The interlocutors are a slave and his master; what each says is, generally speaking, perfectly obvious from the vocatives; but in VII. we may infer from the consistent scheme in other sections that the last two lines are spoken not by the master in continuation of l. 5, but by the slave; and in XII. the scheme suggests as the most probable dis-

[1] *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1918[2]; *Quellen zur Kenntnis der babylonische Religion*, bearbeitet von Erich Ebeling (Leipzig, 1919), pp. 50–70.

tribution: l. 2, master; ll. 3–6, slave; l. 7, master; l. 8, slave. With these preliminary explanations I give the translation:—

VII.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
I will raise a revolt (?). Yes, do so, my lord, do so.
If you raise not a revolt, what (or, empty) is your carcase (?)?
Who will give to you to fill your belly?
No, slave, I will not raise a revolt.
The man who raises a revolt is killed, or (otherwise) it goes hard with him;
He is mutilated, or caught, or cast into prison.

VIII.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
I will love a woman. Yes, love, my lord, love!
A man who loves a woman forgets trouble and care.
No, slave, I will not love a woman. Love not, my lord, love not.
Woman is a pit (or cistern),[1] a hole that is dug:
Woman is an iron dagger, sharp, which cuts a man's throat.

IX.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
Fetch me straightway water for my hands: give it me; an offering will I make to my god.
Make it, my lord, make it. Merry is his heart who makes an offering to his god:
Loan upon loan he makes.
No, slave, I will not make an offering to my god.
Make it not, my lord, make it not!
The god wilt thou teach; like a dog will he follow thee,
Whether 'my ritual' or 'ask not' or ought else he desire of thee.

X.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
I will give food to my country. Give, my lord, give!
A man who gives food to his country, his barley is abundant (?).
No, slave, I will not give food to the country.
Give it not, my lord, give it not!
Creditors will devour thy barley: they will diminish thy barley: moreover, they will curse thee.

XI.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
Help will I give to my country. Give, my lord, give!
A man who gives help to his country
His own help lies in the urn of Marduk.
No, slave, I will not give help to my country.
Give it not, my lord, give it not.
Ascend the hills and traverse the dwellings (?):
Behold the skulls of the hindmost and the foremost.
Where is the harmful, where is the helpful?

XII.

Slave, attend to me! Yes, my lord, yes.
Now, what is good?
To break my neck and thy neck,
To cast into the river—that is good.
Where is the hindmost who ascended to heaven?
Where is the great who captured (?) the (whole) earth?
No, slave, I will kill thee, I will send thee before me.
And, my lord, three days after, how will they live after me!

These six sections of the dialogue suffice to indicate the general character of the whole. The writer balances the advantages and disadvantages of various courses of action; the master proposes a certain course of action; the slave acquiesces, and suggests certain advantages that may accrue from it. Then the master proposes not to do what at first he had proposed to do, and the slave is ready to point out what is disadvantageous in such a course. The dialogue, in addition to the activities referred to in the sections here translated, discusses, in those not here translated, attendance at court, dining, hunting, house-building.

The dialogue thus implies a critical outlook on life: the writer can see advantages and disadvantages in any form of human activity; but the outlook is ultimately pessimistic; for in each section the reasons against any course of action follow and apparently cancel the reasons in favour of it; and in the last section the conclusion seems to be that death is better than life; but still balancing the pros and cons, and not quite resolved whether himself to be or not to be, the master proposes by slaying him to give the slave the chance of putting the great question to the test; and, if we may so interpret the obscure closing line, the slave retorts by pointing out that in this course, too, there is a disadvantage; for without the slave, how will the master fare?

It is in the critical and ultimately pessimistic outlook on life that the Babylonian dialogue offers a parallel to Ecclesiastes: like the Babylonian, the Hebrew writer can find relative advantages for any kind of human activity; 'to every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven' (Ec 3[1]), and the various sections of the Babylonian dialogue develop the double-sidedness of all activities which Ecclesiastes expresses by saying that 'there is a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted,' a time to break down, and a time to build up,' etc.; or, again, in his advice not to be either righteous or wicked

[1] A pit to entrap some one.

overmuch, for there are disadvantages as well as advantages attendant on righteousness, and the same is true of wickedness ($7^{16f.}$). And, as in the dialogue, the final word each time is against any and every form of activity, so in Ecclesiastes the refrain is: 'This also is vanity'; the starting-point, which gives tone to the whole book, is the question: What profit hath a man of all his labour wherever he laboureth under the sun? and the conclusion is that the day of death is better than the day of birth (7^{1}).

It is unnecessary to go further into detail to show that Ebeling was guided by a right instinct in detecting a parallelism between the contents of the dialogue and the contents of Ecclesiastes; or that the parallelism is most striking between the general tone and temper of the two works. The parallelism with Job on the other hand, in so far as it is to be detected, is almost entirely a parallelism of form. It is not, indeed, impossible to find parallel ideas or expressions; for in Job (ch. 3), too, we have a presentation of the idea that death is better than life; but this stands at the *beginning* in Job, and the book moves on to anything but a pessimistic conclusion. Moreover, in the treatment of this idea and throughout, the whole tone and temper of the two works is different; there is no passion in the Babylonian dialogue; in it life is regarded from a cool, calculating, utilitarian standpoint utterly different from the standpoint of Job. Again, there is in Job a criticism of God as currently represented, but nothing approaching the low irreverence of the last line but one of section IX. of the dialogue.

But the parallelism in form with Job, slight as it is, is of great interest. So much in Hebrew literature has been related to Babylonian thought or literary form that it has proved tempting to search for Babylonian parallels to Job, and even to attempt to trace back the great Hebrew poem to Babylonian sources. For a considerable time now fragments of a Babylonian poem have been known to which the name of the 'Babylonian Job'[1] has been given; and the relation of Job to this earlier Babylonian poem has been much discussed. This poem tells, in the words of the sufferer himself, the story of a person of high rank, apparently a king, who, after a long life of prosperity, became a slave and fell sick, and was reduced to despair, though aware of no sin that could justify this change of fortune and having sought in vain to discover from the gods what was amiss. Subsequently the sufferer is released from his sins and sufferings.

Much of this Babylonian poem is obscure, and the exact nature of the relation between it and Job uncertain. But one thing is clear: the *form* of the two works is entirely different: the so-called 'Babylonian Job' is not a dialogue; it is the utterance of a single speaker. Thus, even if we were to admit, what is improbable, that what is common to the thought of the Babylonian and Hebrew poems was due to the direct influence of the former over the latter, Babylon would thereby supply no anticipation of the *form* of the Book of Job, which is so little anticipated or paralleled in Hebrew or other early Semitic literature. It is this anticipation or parallelism of form that the new Babylonian fragment in some measure supplies. In it we find dialogue used for the purpose of discussing aspects or problems of life. It has also another formal resemblance to Job, viz. its schematic character. But in both respects the differences are not less striking: in the Babylonian fragment the dialogue is rudimentary, the scheme rigid. In Job the schematism scarcely extends beyond the order of response and the general character of the speeches, which are all of some length and never brief interruptions or explanations; in all three cycles of speeches the friends speak in the same order, Eliphaz first, Bildad second, Ṣophar third, Job replying to each in turn.[2] But in the Babylonian dialogue each section is cast in the same mould; and for examples of such schematism we must look elsewhere in Hebrew literature; *e.g.* to the framework of Judges and Kings, or to the prophetic poem in Am 1. 2; the nearest approach to it in Job, and that a very remote one, is seen in the fact that the speeches of the friends almost uniformly open interrogatively.

The new Babylonian fragment is in form a dialogue, as is the central part of the Book of Job, and it is possible that the lost opening may have formed a remote parallel to the Prologue to Job.

[1] An English translation of part of the poem may be found in R. W. Rogers' *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, 164–169. An English translation of all known at the time, together with an exhaustive discussion, was contributed by Jastrow to the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1906, pp. 135–196. But fresh fragments have come to light since, and a new English translation is much needed.

[2] In the present text the third cycle is incomplete, lacking any speech of Ṣophar.

But there is nothing in the conclusion which survives that is any way similar either to the speech of Yahweh or to the Epilogue in the Hebrew work. And even the resemblance to the dialogue between Job and his friends is strictly limited; not merely has it but two interlocutors instead of four, but there is much less indication of character. The characters in Job, indeed, are less fully developed and differentiated than in other great dramatic literature, but far more so than the master and the slave in the Babylonian dialogue. Indeed, except perhaps in the last two lines, the two persons of the dialogue are the merest device for presenting two aspects of various forms of human activity.

Thus the main and perhaps the only but yet a sufficient justification for instituting any comparison between the Babylonian and the Hebrew works lies in this, that Job in respect of its form has hitherto occupied a quite isolated position in earlier Semitic literature. The distance between it and this recently discovered Babylonian dialogue is still great; future discoveries[1] may or may not do something to fill up the gap.

[1] Two other Babylonian dialogues have also been published by Ebeling in *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*: but he found himself unable to carry out his purpose of publishing these with translations in the *Mitteilungen* (see the *Vorwort* to the second heft of the *Mitteilungen*).

Literature.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

The most important event in the interpretation of the New Testament, since Sir William Ramsay began the issue of his books on St. Paul, is the publication by Messrs. Macmillan of the first volume of a series on *The Beginnings of Christianity*, to be edited by Dr. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Dr. Kirsopp Lake.

'The leading idea of this series is to continue the work begun by the late Bishop Lightfoot in editing Christian documents historically as well as critically. His great contributions of commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, Galatians, Colossians and Philemon, and Philippians, were succeeded by his masterly editions of the Ignatian literature and of Clement of Rome. It is now proposed to follow up these by an edition of the Acts of the Apostles in three volumes, and to extend the series down to the day when the Church obtained official recognition by the Roman Empire.' Part I. (in three volumes) will deal with the Acts of the Apostles, the first volume giving an account of the Jewish, Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds, the second containing the Criticism, and the third the Text and Commentary. The first volume has now been issued (18s. net). It consists of four sections with five appendixes. The first section, on the Jewish World, is divided into four chapters—Chapter I. 'The Background of Jewish History,' by the Editors; Chapter II. 'The Spirit of Judaism,' by Mr. C. G. Montefiore; Chapter III. 'Varieties of Thought and Practice in Judaism,' and Chapter IV. 'The Dispersion,' both by the Editors. The second section describes the Gentile World. It is divided into two chapters—'The Roman Provincial System,' by Mr. H. T. F. Duckworth, and 'Life in the Roman Empire at the Beginning of the Christian Era,' by Professor Clifford H. Moore. Primitive Christianity is the subject of the last and longest section. It is written entirely by the Editors. Its last chapter is on Christology. The Appendixes are on 'The Zealots,' by the Editors; 'Nazarene and Nazareth,' by Professor George F. Moore; 'The Slavonic Josephus,' by the Editors; 'Differences of Legal Interpretations between Pharisees and Sadducees, by the same; 'The Am ha-ares (the People of the Land) and the Haberim' (Associates), by Professor Moore.

Now it is unnecessary to say that here we have the last word of scholarship. No doubt some of it will be out of date thirty years hence, as some of Lightfoot's work is out of date and erroneous now. But to-day it is all that is known. The only question is, Can the judgment of the editors be relied upon? And that question cannot be answered yet. When the volume on the criticism comes we shall see; we shall see more clearly when we can examine the volume containing the commentary. This volume is a matter of learning, pure and simple.

But notice one fact. Mr. C. G. Montefiore has

been chosen to write the chapter on 'The Spirit of Judaism.' That is the method adopted in THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Let the believer in the movement tell what the movement is. He can tell it from the inside. He must keep to fact, but let him give his own interpretation of the facts. It is only when we know the best that can be said of man or movement that we know that movement or that man.

THE DEVIL AND SATAN.

Professor H. B. Swete delivered a course of lectures on *The Parables of the Kingdom.* They have now been published, under the care of two of his pupils (Macmillan ; 7s. 6d. net).

It is a long time since we had a strong book on the Parables. And yet no part of Scripture more demands or more repays sure handling. Professor Swete's book is short and authoritative. One might prophesy with little venture that it will become the most popular of all his books.

On the Parable of the Tares he comes to 'the enemy.' The enemy is the Devil, explained our Lord. In an after-note Swete says: 'So many Christians now deny that there is any personal Devil that it is worth while to labour this point a little. First as to the names: *devil* is of course merely one who accuses, maligns; *Satan* is merely an adversary, or, as the parable translates it, an enemy. But the Satan, the Devil, singles out a particular person who is pre-eminently the Adversary, the Accuser; the person who, as St. John says, is commonly called *Devil* and *the Satan.* This person is mentioned only in the later post-exilic books of the Old Testament, and by name only in three passages, Zechariah iii., Job i., and 1 Chronicles xxi.; and the natural inference is that this conception of *the Satan* or personal adversary of God and men—at least under this name—was a somewhat late importation into Jewish theology, possibly as some say of Babylonian or Persian origin. Into that question I need not now go; in any case it was in our Lord's time an article of common belief among the Jews, and was accepted, as it seems, by our Lord in His teaching. The question is whether, this being so, it is binding on Christians, or rather whether it is to be taken as expressing a great and tremendous fact in the spiritual world.

'Now it is clear, I think, that our Lord *did* accept current terms, and even current beliefs, so far as it was possible to do this consistently with essential truth. It is characteristic of His teaching to start with what people believed, and to use their own expressions and terms so far as He could. You see this in His use of the word *Gehenna*, and *Paradise*, and *Abraham's Bosom*, and perhaps also in much of what He says about demons; for instance, it seems evident that the boy from whom He cast out a demon (Mc ix.) was subject to what we should now call epilepsy; and that when Jesus rebuked the deaf and dumb spirit, He used popular language just as He did when He rebuked the raging winds and sea, as if they had been living things. But His constant acceptance of the principle that a personal evil power presides over all that antagonism to the good will of God which we can plainly see at work is, as it seems to me, far too grave a matter to be treated as a mere concession to popular belief. Even in the case of possession it may be suspected that there is very much more of truth in the current belief than many moderns suppose. But whatever may be thought of the connexion of alien will-power with certain diseases such as epilepsy, there is nothing in science which can disprove the existence of a central personal force of evil such as the New Testament and the teaching of our Lord Himself presuppose. And though I am not prepared to assert that the existence of a personal Devil is an article of the Christian faith, to decry which is heresy in the ecclesiastical sense, I am bound to say that to deny the existence of a personal Devil seems to introduce a grave element of uncertainty into the teaching of Christ and of the Apostles; for of what can we feel sure if on this very fundamental question that teaching is not to be taken seriously?'

THE PRAYER BOOK.

No demand seems to have been more often or more earnestly made by the men in the trenches, when they opened their minds to the padre (if they were of the Church of England), than that there should be a great alteration made in the Prayer Book. And the padre himself, when he had time to record his impression, was as urgent and earnest as the men.

Has anything been done? The Prayer Book is as it was, and no official sanction has been given to an abbreviated or otherwise altered use of it. But tacitly men are encouraged to meet the

strongly felt desire for brevity and intelligibility. If they shorten the service or modernize the language it is understood that they will not be called to account.

But that is not enough. Eight years before the War there arose a public movement for the revision of the Prayer Book. It began with a modification of the Ornaments Rubric. Once begun, the revision went forward. On one part after another there was 'debate, consideration, consultation, and agreement,' until at last it has been found possible to issue an edition of *The Book of Common Prayer* with the main proposals and suggestions incorporated. The edition has been prepared by the Rev. John Neale Dalton, M.A., F.S.A., Canon of Windsor. It is issued from the Cambridge University Press (30s. net).

It is issued without authority. The editor emphasizes that. What is its object? 'If a revised edition of the Book of Common Prayer is ever to become the prayer book of the Church of England, this can only be attained, not by resolution of Convocation or by authority of Parliament, but by the mature judgment that Church people, clerical and lay, have formed upon its merits; yet if that opinion and judgment is to be of real and worthy influence it must be well-informed.' The aim of this edition is to induce a 'thoughtful public opinion on these matters, by simply and frankly shewing what the approximate result would be of the adoption of certain of these Proposals on the text of the present Prayer Book, together with some other rather important additional Suggestions.'

The Psalter required revision most of all. The language has often been altered. But the editor would not have it supposed that he has simply used the Authorized and Revised Versions. 'It will be evident,' he says, 'how often recourse has been had to the earlier Coverdale, and how surprisingly modern are some of his renderings of the rocky terseness of the original. Of the verses that were recommended to be omitted in recitation by Canterbury Convocation, only six in Psalm 69 and fourteen in Psalm 109, one verse only in Psalm 137, and one verse in Psalm 140 have here not been printed. These practically are the only omissions which the Upper House of York Convocation desired. But in Psalm 141, verses six to eight are so corrupt or obscure that they convey now scarcely any real meaning at all, and so have been omitted. One might perhaps be tempted to do the same with verses twenty-nine to thirty-one in Psalm 68, were it not that the whole of that grand Psalm resembles a Pindaric Ode in its reference to persons and places, semi-obscure to later readers, but no doubt clear in the author's time to his own contemporaries.'

The volume is a triumph of the art of printing.

THE ODES AND PSALMS OF SOLOMON.

A new edition has been published of the Odes of Solomon. It includes the Psalms of Solomon, and is in two volumes. The first volume contains the Text with facsimile reproductions (10s. 6d. net). The second volume contains a Translation with Introduction and Critical as well as Expository Notes (21s. net). The publishers are Messrs. Longmans. The title is *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, re-edited for the Governors of the John Rylands Library by Rendel Harris and Alphonse Mingana.

'The Odes of Solomon (in a Syriac translation, accompanied by the Psalms of Solomon) were discovered by Rendel Harris on Jan. 4, 1909, in a MS. in his collection, which is said by the discoverer to have come from the banks of the Tigris. It was numbered in that collection Cod. Syr. 152, and has now been transferred to the John Rylands Library, where it stands as Cod. Syr. 9. The MS. is a small paper volume, much worn and stained, and has lost, apparently, three leaves at the beginning and perhaps three leaves at the end. In other respects it is complete, very carefully written and legible, forming a volume of 56 leaves preserved from an original volume of 62 leaves. The first and second Odes and the opening of the third Ode stood on the leaves that were lost at the beginning; and the Psalms of Solomon at the other end of the book are defective from Ps 17^{38} to the end. The omissions are to be regretted, especially at the beginning of the book, but they are not serious, and the missing first Ode has been recovered from the *Pistis Sophia*, so that what is really lost in the Odes is the second Ode and some verses at the beginning of the third Ode. The defect at the other end of the book has been met almost completely by the British Museum MS. discovered by Professor Burkitt.'

In the editing of the text, account has been taken of the suggestions of many scholars, but

only the most assured emendations have been incorporated. Others have been discussed in the critical notes to each ode in the second volume. One important change has, however, been made in the text of this edition. 'In working carefully through the text, the editors became convinced that they were dealing with matter that was either Oriental in origin or so coloured by Oriental modes of thought and expression as to be practically Oriental, and they decided that it was necessary to reconstruct, as far as possible, the rhythms which underlay the recovered Syriac text, and which showed remarkable parallelism with early Syriac poetry. The text has accordingly been broken up; and this made it necessary to redistribute and renumber the verses as they were given in Dr. Harris's *editio princeps*: such change in standards of reference is in itself undesirable, but any student who examines the new arrangement of the text will see that it could not very well, in the present case, be avoided.'

The Introduction, which is found in the second volume, is a remarkably acute and lucid product of British scholarship, fit to stand beside any continental work. Note some conclusions:

(1) Time and Place:—'If we are wrong in assigning them as written at Antioch in the first century, we are not far wrong either in place or in time.'

(2) Jewish or Christian?—'We shall assume them to be Christian, for all objections on this side are either superficial and need not be regarded, or they are such as are evanescent as soon as we succeed in getting at the meaning of the author. No one who has spent any time on the study of the book would lay any stress on the fact that the name of Jesus does not appear in its pages, for it is clear that the author has a distinct Christology, not very different from that of the Nicene theology, and employs most of the terms and figures in which the early Christians expressed their doctrine of the Divine nature. His Christ is the Christian's Christ, with an Incarnation in terms more pronounced, in some respects, than the New Testament itself.'

(3) Greek or Syriac?—The balance of the argument is on the side of Greek rather than Syriac as the original.

When we pass to the Notes we are still in the land of lucidity and the interest has increased. It is a strange circumstance that the two clauses in the Creed which are now most severely criticised, the Virgin Birth and the Descent into Hades, are dealt with in the Odes, the one in the 19th, the other in the 22nd. The Notes on these two Odes are full of curious information—the serpent of Paradise and the Dragon myth, the reason why Moses was told to take hold of the serpent into which his rod was turned by the tail and not by the head (*Christ* being appointed to bruise the *head* of the serpent) and much else.

THE CHANGING EAST.

We are very familiar with the idea of the unchanging East. Professor Edward Caldwell Moore of Harvard is struck with the rapidity and thoroughness of the change that is coming over the East. So in his title *West and East* (Duckworth; 12s. 6d. net) he puts the West first. For the change, seen most vividly in Japan, is due to the adoption of Western civilization. His volume (the Dale Lectures, given at Mansfield College, Oxford, in 1913) is occupied with the causes that have led the East to submit at last and so drastically to change, and with the development of the change in social, political, and religious life.

The causes are of two kinds. 'There has been, in the first place, frank advocacy of western principles of trade and government and, more recently, of secular education. These have been put forth at times by western men as the sole means of creating even the simplest conditions of well-being in the East. For example, in the newly opened parts of Africa, or again in poverty-stricken regions of India and China, there has been an avowed propaganda on behalf of western political and social and economic ideas and a generous sympathy with efforts of orientals to transform their institutions in consonance with these ideas. With enthusiasm men from the West resident in the East have thrown themselves into the work of education in these lands, into philanthropy and reform, into the healing and prevention of disease, into efforts for the mitigation of evils of every sort, and for the amelioration of all conditions of life. This movement has been avowedly secular in its interest. It has often boasted of its contrast with the missionary endeavour. The other motive is moral and religious in its nature. It has aimed primarily at changes in the inner life and religious convictions of men. There has been, mainly

since the last decade of the eighteenth century and practically throughout the non-European world, a wide and zealous propaganda on behalf of the western man's religion. There has been a great enthusiasm for Christian missions.'

Professor Moore believes that these two movements are not antagonistic and ought never to have been suspicious of one another. The secular movement is not 'able to complete its work without advancing towards the area of that which is in principle ethical and religious.'

'The missionary movement also has never been able to complete its work, or even greatly to advance that work, without calling to its aid factors which are not exclusively those of the inner life. The religious spirit must find expression in the outward life of man. There are traits of Christian character which are developed only as men engage in their trades and politics and co-operate in their social organizations and economic endeavours. The highest type of Christian missionary has often been, to an extent of which he was perhaps not aware, the exponent of certain political ideas and educational principles as well.'

These causes are then shown at work throughout the East; but, as already said, most conspicuously in Japan. Politically and economically the change in Japan is thorough enough. The religious change is not so evident. Will Japan become Christian? 'Of the three great religions of Japan, two are foreign to Japan. They came as missionary religions. They must have undergone the process of nationalization and naturalization in Japan, of assimilation of themselves to Japan and of Japan to them. Can they undergo that process once more? It is not that they have again to travel to a world across the sea. The world from across the sea has travelled to them. The result is the same. They have not come again to the need of naturalization. The need of naturalization has come to them. They have only to stand still and do nothing in order to become alien religions in the new Japan, precisely as the paganism which was indigenous to Italy became an alien religion in Italy when the dying old world and the rising new world had asked the questions which Christianity alone could answer. If that happens the strange religion from the far West will be the one which will be at home in the East. It will be naturalized and assimilated and bound by a thousand ties to all the rest of the life of new Japan.'

PROGRESS.

Dr. J. B. Bury, Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, has written a book on *The Idea of Progress* (Macmillan; 14s. net).

Professor Bury's recent attitude to life is puzzling. He does not say, and he may not think, that it is not worth living, but he makes manifest that he does not think it worth taking seriously. It is not an unusual result of what is called 'free-thinking.' Professor Bury is a rationalist. His whole soul is given to the consideration of things that are present and seen. And the issue is disappointment.

This book is an inquiry into the origin and growth of the idea of progress. But Professor Bury is not interested in the idea of progress. Other people are interested in it, and he traces the history of their interest. But he does not share it. For what is progress? It is scientific discovery, the increase of knowledge and of the means of luxurious living. Professor Bury is not concerned about scientific progress. He does not believe in the increase of knowledge. It might be all right if, as knowledge grows from more to more, reverence dwelt more within us. But as it is, he is of the mind of Koheleth, that he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.

What, then, is progress? What else is it? If it were increase of the knowledge of God, if it were the recognition of the Spirit dwelling among us and leading us into all the truth—that would be something to believe in, something worth believing in. But Professor Bury does not believe in that.

And so the book ends in an anti-climax of almost incredible emptiness. It ends with these two queries: 'Does not Progress itself suggest that its value as a doctrine is only relative, corresponding to a certain not very advanced stage of civilisation; just as Providence, in its day, was an idea of relative value, corresponding to a stage somewhat less advanced? Or will it be said that this argument is merely a disconcerting trick of dialectic played under cover of the darkness in which the issue of the future is safely hidden by Horace's prudent god?'

What is the difference between training and education? Mr. George Willis says it is a difference of speech. A boy who has had a Public

School training is educated, 'however stubbornly he has resisted the educational influences to which he has been subjected,' simply because he has been taught a little Latin; the boy who has been educated at a national school is only trained, 'no matter what aptitude and diligence he has shown in his schooldays,' simply because he has learned no Latin. It is a matter of speech. The one can speak well, the other cannot. 'An uneducated person is known by his speech, or rather by his want of speech, by the narrowness of his range of expression and apprehension. The reason of this deficiency is not hard to discover. Two-thirds of English words are borrowed from the Latin. Therefore in order to understand the English language of to-day, it is necessary to have some knowledge of the elements of Latin.'

Mr. Willis has written a book on *The Philosophy of Speech* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is original; it is readable; it has the making of speakers in it, if speakers can be made.

Dr. Rudolph Steiner's *The Threefold State* has been translated into English (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). It is an attempt to solve the social problem. As in the body there are three systems, that of the nerves and senses, that of the circulation of the blood, and that of the digestion; so in the social world there are three systems, the economic, the political, and the spiritual or individual. And it is by giving each of these parts of social life its proper place and co-ordinating them that the social problem is solved. The three branches of the body social 'must not be artificially centralized into some abstract theoretical kind of unity in a parliament or otherwise. They must become three actual, living members of the social body, each centred in itself, working alongside one another and in co-operation.' The three elements correspond to the three watchwords of the French Revolution—Fraternity, Equality, Liberty.

John Handyside, a brilliant student in philosophy at the University of Edinburgh, and subsequently Lecturer in Philosophy in the University of Liverpool, was killed in the war on October 18th, 1916. Professor Pringle Pattison has discovered three essays which he had written; and, with a biographical preface, he has edited and published them. *The Historical Method in Ethics, and other Essays,* is the title (Constable; 5s. net). The essay which gives the volume its title is the longest and most mature—a fine exposition of that method as applied to Ethics which we now apply so successfully to Theology. The others are on 'The Absolute and "Intellect"' and 'System and Mechanism.' In the last there is an acute discussion of teleology.

Few events of a literary kind will give more pleasure to scholars than the resumption after the War of the Oxford edition of *The Works of Aristotle translated into English.* The new part contains the *Oeconomica and the Atheniensium Respublica* (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 5s. net). The Oeconomica is translated by Mr. E. S. Forster, M.A., Lecturer in Greek in the University of Sheffield, the Respublica by Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, K.C.B., F.B.A. Both are scholars' translations, the original being expressed in English as accurately as possible and less consideration being given to the flow of language. Both again have footnotes and a brief introduction. When the whole edition is translated the parts as issued will be arranged in eleven volumes, for which binding cases will be supplied by the publishers. The general editor, it will be remembered, is Mr. W. D. Ross, Fellow of Oriel College.

The demand most urgently addressed to the preacher at present is to make Christianity real, and that usually means moral and social. There is great impatience with 'theology.' But what is theology? In this demand it is the New Birth. And the Rev. Hunter Smith, for one, is very sure that without regeneration morality, whether social or individual, is impossible. His book is all about the social aspect of religion—the religious aspect of competition, Capital and Labour, Work and Wages, Riches, Politics, and the like. Hence the title *The Economics of the Kingdom of God* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). But before the book is ended you read this:

'We have recently had the most startling evidence of the complete ignorance, or gross misunderstanding of the truths and facts of Christianity displayed by the vast majority of the people. Various have been the reasons given for such a tragic state of things, and various the remedies suggested. They are all more or less plausible and urgent. But in all the inquiries and discussions that have followed, one inexorable fact

seems to have been forgotten, or, at least, lightly regarded. It is emphatically stated by St. Paul: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Here is the fundamental problem that confronts all who are distressed by the decay of religion among all classes, and are agonising for its revival. It is a problem that meets us directly in those amazing but incontestable statements that the great mass of our young men, as encountered in the army, simply do not know what Christianity means, and regard the teaching and testimony of the churches as unintelligible and remote from real life. It is admitted that they have nearly all been baptised, that is, they have had some sort of family connection with the Church—and have nearly all been religiously instructed in their childhood. The teaching may have been defective—though that is still a matter to be determined—but so much is clear, that whatever they may have learned they have forgotten or ignored, and whatever they hear they misconstrue. St. Paul found the same thing in his own generation, and so did Isaiah in his. The Christian Apostle quotes the words of the Hebrew Prophet to describe his own experience. Christ Himself makes the same reference when He would indicate the results of His own ministry. "By hearing ye shall hear and not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive." There are an incapacity and a resistance in human nature which baffle the most earnest and clearest efforts to state the truth. Jesus put the problem in its plainest form when He said: "Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." In fact, the natural man must be radically and entirely changed before we can look for any understanding or response from him.'

Messrs. Longmans have issued a cheap edition of Professor W. H. Griffith Thomas's well-known manual of evangelical theology, *The Catholic Faith* (1s. 6d. net).

A Memoir of *Father Maturin* has been written by Maisie Ward (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). The memoir is short. The greater part of the volume is occupied with selections from Father Maturin's letters. The letters are in a very large proportion occupied with the question of passing from the Anglican to the Roman Church. The Rev. W. B. Maturin 'went over' himself, and naturally was much consulted by those who 'trembled on the brink.' His advice was always the same: If you are sure you should go, go; if you are not sure, don't. Nearly everybody who consulted him went. Of only one is it said, 'she had not gone when the correspondence ended.'

We do not know that the case *against* the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles has ever been put more convincingly (though quite popularly) than by the Rev. Alexander Nairne, D.D., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, in his book entitled *The Faith of the New Testament* (Longmans; 6s. net). The book contains the Hulsean Lectures of 1919–1920. Its title is accurate. What we find in it is the Gospel of the first followers as nearly as we can now come to it. And we further find that it is the Gospel for us.

After speaking of the lack of external testimony to the Pastorals, and contrasting the organization of the Church therein with that underlying the accepted Epistles of St. Paul, Dr. Nairne says:

'There is, however, one true difficulty which does still daunt the student, and the more he is an enthusiastic and reverent admirer of S. Paul the more it daunts him. It is that in the Pastorals the essential mind of S. Paul is generally absent. We shall see more distinctly as we go on what that mind is. For the present let us merely quote Gal. ii. 20, "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me." This deep, personal, intellectual, and moral passion informs all the other epistles. There is hardly a trace of it in the regulations, advice, and warning which fill the pages of the Pastorals. And this cannot be accounted for by their "pastoral" character. There are plenty of directions, rules, and admonitions in the other epistles. But there all starts from and runs out into this very marked theology; all this (to repeat the word) "informed" by it. In the Pastorals it is not so. Those who have learned the terms from Dr. Bigg would say that the "mystic" has turned "disciplinarian." That would, of course, be no disparagement of the Pastorals: Dr. Bigg took the noble first epistle of S. Peter as the type of disciplinarian theology.

But it is a question whether such a change would befall so uncommon, so complete, and so deeply moulded a character as S. Paul's. And there is a further embarrassment. This Pauline mind does not run through the Pastorals with lessened or diverted intensity. For whole paragraphs it is not there at all. But now and again it appears, contrasting with the context. The passage in 2 Timothy (iv. 6 ff.) already quoted is an instance; and again and again in this epistle especially we seem to catch and lose again the well-known accent.'

The Armenian Question is admirably handled by M. Pierre Crabitès in an Introduction to the English translation of *Armenia and the Armenians*, by Mr. Kevork Aslan (Macmillan; $1.25). It is handled with full knowledge and fine temper. Such a presentation of the Armenian case before the Peace Conference should be (and by the time this is published probably has been) as successful in securing a good settlement for Armenia as Venezelos has succeeded in obtaining for Greece. The book, written originally in French by an Armenian, is a history of the Armenians from the earliest times to the latest, a valuable history of a wonderful race. Frederick the Great's chaplain pointed to the preservation of the Jews as the great evidence for Providence; the preservation of the Armenians is yet more providential.

Dr. Roland G. Usher, Professor of History in Washington University, St. Louis, has written *The Story of the Great War* within the compass of a single volume, and has found room for a large number of maps and illustrations (Macmillan; $2.50). It is a handy square volume of just three hundred and fifty pages. This Professor of History has the gift of condensation, and with it the gift of lucidity. He gives us the pleasure of seeing both the wood and the trees, for he loves to sketch a great broad movement and again he loves to describe a single great act. He has even had space left for the introduction of causes and consequences. For instance: 'One of the reasons why the Germans began the war was the belief that the British Empire was so weak and disloyal that it could not resist assault. One of the reasons why the Germans were defeated in the war was the loyalty and strength of the British Empire. The Germans were sure that the war would create a new Empire surpassing in extent and power any of the old Empires. They were right; the war has created a new British Empire, stronger, more unified than ever before, a real state whose importance in times to come will be incalculable.'

The Divinity of Man (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net) is not an inviting title. It has unholy associations. The unbeliever in the Divinity of Christ does not now deny it; he affirms the Divinity of Man. Mr. Reginald Wells is not an unbeliever in the Divinity of Christ. In a Postscript to this book he sets forth the articles of his creed, and one of them is that 'he believes the Lord Jesus to be God.' That is more than any Unitarian would say. But in the same article he says that 'he also believes the divinity of all men to differ from that of the Lord in degree and not, as seems to be the opinion of most clergymen, in kind,' and that takes all value away from the assertion of the Divinity of Christ.

The purpose of the book is to encourage men to believe that they have their salvation in their own hands. No outside person or influence should be allowed to interfere. 'Men are God, and the only plea that they allow themselves to hear is the appeal to their divinity. Any master knows that a boy will respond to an appeal to his honour, when all other appeal is vain. And this is true of men. Not all the pains of hell or earth shall frighten a man from fornication. He may restrain his bodily desires when he hears God whispering within himself, and when he sees God looking at him through the eyes of the partner of his shame.'

If it is not a foolish it is certainly a futile position. Experience, plentiful and bitter, has proved its futility. Does this young chaplain imagine that men would have believed, and gone on believing, in an entrance into this world of the Son of God and His death of Atonement on the Cross, if they could have found salvation by looking into the eyes of their partners in sin? He says many true things, and he says them in a fresh original way, a way that gives them adhesiveness, but his purpose in publishing is not worth achieving and never will be achieved.

'The Christian Association of the University of Pennsylvania recently started a campaign to induce at least two thousand students to read during the Lenten period the life and sayings of Jesus as

presented in their simplest form by the book of Mark. The first announcement of the course read:

"Christianity = x + y
y = 'isms'
This is an equation, not an identity."

After this statement of the equation had been posted long enough to arouse some curiosity in the student body, the second announcement, which was explanatory of the first, was made. It read as follows:

"Has Christianity failed?
Or only its 'isms'?
What did Jesus teach?"

'Those who pledged themselves to undertake this course were organized into seventy-two discussion groups. These groups arranged to meet once a week under the direction of a leader at fraternity houses, dormitories, classrooms, and the committee rooms of the Houston (Student's) Club. The leaders were enlisted from the faculty men, Christian Association secretaries, older students, and extramural friends of the University, and the conduct of a normal class for training the leaders was assigned to me as the representative of our School of Education.'

The 'me' is Professor Frank Pierrepont Graves, Ph.D. The book which Professor Graves has written, and which he has called *What did Jesus Teach?* (Macmillan, $1.75), contains the course of lectures which he gave to that normal class. Here is the summary of them: What did Jesus teach? 'Jesus described God as "father," with the attributes of protecting care, pity, and forgiveness, and held that men became the sons of God by adopting these characteristics. On the social side, he regarded God as "king," and made humility, purity, and service the test of membership in his Kingdom. These ideals, then, lead to a process of reconstructing one's life known as "conversion," and the state attained thereby is called "salvation." In his teaching concerning the hereafter, according to John, Jesus asserted a present resurrection, as well as a future. The same evangelist represents him as teaching that judgments are constantly being made, but culminate in final judgments; and that reward and punishment will not consummate with death. For the solution of social problems—divorce, the family, diversions, wealth, almsgiving, industrial conditions, and politics, Jesus has furnished principles and not definite rules. And his utterances upon any problem were illustrative of these principles, and, growing out of the occasion, often seem contradictory, unless they are examined together.'

It is a clever convincing summary. But Professor Graves must be rebuked for one almost incredible blunder. He speaks of 'rendering the prostitute Magdalene a virtuous disciple.'

In *A Unitarian's Thought of God* (Lindsey Press; 2s. 6d. net) you will find as clear and conscientious an account of what Christianity is without Christ as you will find anywhere. It *is* Christianity. For though the Rev. Christopher J. Street, M.A., LL.B., is a theist, he cannot escape from his Christian surroundings. The theism he believes in he finds in the Gospels. But it is Christianity without Christ. For it is without that 'power of God unto salvation' which comes from faith in 'Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.'

China is a large country and needs a large book to describe it. Bishop James W. Bashford's *China: An Interpretation* (Abingdon Press; $3.50 net) runs now, in its third edition, to 668 pages. His idea was to give such an estimate of China as Viscount Bryce gave of the United States, Lafcadio Hearn of Japan, and President Lowell of England—a better estimate every one (so he says) than any native has ever given.

The book was published in 1916. Within three months it had to be issued in a second edition, to which the author added a long chapter on Yuan Shih Kai, the ambitious politician who was made Emperor in December 1915, but had to descend from the throne within six months and dissolve the Empire. Then Bishop Bashford died. His secretaries, James H. Lewis and J. P. MacMillan, have brought out the third edition. They have added another long chapter, dealing with the Origin and Qualities of the Chinese, and bringing the history of China up to date.

'My message would be salvation by faith in an atoning Saviour and risen Lord, and no sneers of "the enlightened" or clamour of "the liberals" would cause me to change it one iota. A great deal of the talk about the new age needing a new message is arrant nonsense. Down at bottom the "new age" will be just like all other ages, made up of

sinful men and women who need a Saviour, and no substitution of a "Christ ideal" for the historical Jesus can meet that need. Neither Hellenistic naturalism nor a creedless church, made up of those who believe anything or nothing, can save the world. "Christ crucified is unto the Greeks foolishness," now as in the day of Saint Paul, but unto them which are called, in every age, he is "the power of God and the wisdom of God."'

These are brave words, but there is no bravado in them. They are truth and they are life. For they are not the words of Andrew Gillies only, but also of the Christ Himself and His apostles. In that temper and with that clearness of faith Mr. Gillies writes all the essays contained in *The Individualistic Gospel* (Methodist Book Concern; $1.25 net).

In short pithy chapters, some of them almost sensational, all of them arresting, the Rev. Fred. A. Rees discourses to young men on *Honour and Heroism* (R.T.S.; 3s. net).

To have a Gospel is one thing, to bestow it is another. The Rev. J. S. M. Hooper, M.A., in *The Approach to the Gospel* (S.C.M.; 1s. net) warns us in offering the Gospel to others (1) not to put premature emphasis on theology; or (2) on the Divinity of Christ; or (3) on aspects not emphasized by Jesus. In the last warning he refers to God's omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience. Then he introduces us directly to the Christ of the Gospels; for the Gospel is in the Gospels and the Gospel is Christ.

'Thoughtful men and women in our day are concerned as men have seldom been before to get at reality in religion.' That is the first sentence in Mr. Henry Kingman's *Building on Rock*, a study in Character-Building under the Master Builder (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). And it is reality that is searched for throughout the book. It is reality in Faith, Service, Prayer, Fellowship, and all the rest of the great Christian energies. The book is most invigorating. This is one of the illustrations used in it: 'In the common room of Magdalene College, Cambridge, two portraits hang on the wall, facing each other across the table, portraits of two men who shared the zest of life to the fullest and who fought hard for life's prizes. One is of Pepys—sleek, satisfied, kindly, sensuous; a man who cheerfully tried to skim the cream off life's surface for himself and measurably succeeded. The other is of Charles Kingsley, who also delighted in life beyond most men, but whose heart burned like a flame in sympathy with the wrongs and sorrows of the poor, and who gave himself, like his Master, in generous devotion to all who needed him. And his face, lined with love and pain, is of one who looked ineffably far beyond the getting and spending of life's pleasures. It is not so much that one man had a different philosophy from the other, though this was true, as that one man lived in the closest contact with the spirit of Jesus and the other instinctively avoided any contact with Him more intimate than that of formal religion. But the world to-day, in its present mood, recognizes in good-natured Pepys the despair of society, and in Charles Kingsley, with all his limitations, the power that can lift it out of its despair.'

In his exposition of the parable of *The Prodigal Son* (Scott; 2s. net) the Rev. Claude Dunbar Paterson disregards the elder brother, though it was on his account, and to him, that the parable was spoken. He misses the meaning still further, and that of all the parables, by discovering a spiritual reference in every detail. Thus he says that six gifts were bestowed on the prodigal when he returned—the kiss, the robe, the ring, the shoes, the feast, the merriment; and these six have as their spiritual counterparts pardon, purity, position, power, plenty, pleasures.

An unpretentious but singularly informing book on Japan has been published by the Central Board of Missions and the S.P.C.K., with the title of *New Life in the Oldest Empire* (6s. net). The author, Mr. Charles F. Sweet, gives us provokingly little information about himself; but it is evident that he has eyes to see and has seen. He is not impressed with the sincerity of the Japanese rulers, he fears their ambition and its unscrupulous methods; but he loves the people. His earnest desire is that we should throw all the resources at our disposal into the task of making Japan Christian—for Japan's sake, for the sake of China, and for the sake of the civilization of the world.

Four volumes have been added to the S.P.C.K. 'Texts for Students': (1) *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (4d. net) and (2) *The Epistle of Barnabas*

(6d. net), both edited by the Rev. T. W. Crafer, D.D.; (3) *The Code of Hammurabi* (in an English translation), by Percy Handcock, M.A. (1s. net); (4) *Select Passages illustrating Commercial and Diplomatic Relations between England and Russia*, by A. Weiner, M.A., F.R.Hist.S. (1s. 6d. net).

Note also the issue of two more volumes of the 'Helps for Students of History': *Introduction to the Study of Russian History*, by W. F. Reddaway (8d. net), and *A Guide to the History of Education*, by Professor J. W. Adamson (8d. net).

One of the discoveries of early Church literature made in our day is a work of Irenaeus called the Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching. It was found in an Armenian translation, and is quite unknown otherwise beyond a few quotations from the original Greek in early writers. The manuscript containing it was discovered 'in December 1904, in the Church of the Blessed Virgin at Eriwan in Armenia, by Dr. Karapet Ter-Mekerttshian, one of the most learned of the Armenian clergy. It was edited by him with a translation into German, in conjunction with Dr. Edward Ter-Minassiantz, in 1907, in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* (xxxi. 1); and Dr. Harnack added a brief dissertation and some notes. Then in 1912 Dr. Simon Weber, of the Faculty of Catholic Theology in the University of Freiburg in Breisgau, being dissatisfied with this presentation of the work, published a fresh translation with the help of some Armenian scholars. Neither of these translations satisfies the needs of English patristic students. The second, though it corrects some errors of the first, is far less close to the original text. And both are vitiated by a want of acquaintance with the textual criticism of the Septuagint and the Greek New Testament, and also with the larger work of St. Irenaeus himself.' Accordingly the Dean of Wells, Dr. J. Armitage Robinson, has translated the Armenian text into English. The title is *St. Irenaeus: The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net).

In the Introduction Dr. Robinson discusses the Debt of Irenaeus to Justin Martyr, and the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Justin and Irenaeus.

For the *Bibliotheca* of Photius we have hitherto had to go to Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, with its translation into Latin by the Jesuit Andreas Schott. Now at last, through the enterprise of the S.P.C.K., we are to enjoy the easy reading of a modern English translation. Mr. J. H. Freese is to be the translator. The whole work will run to six volumes with the title of *The Library of Photius*. Five volumes will be required for the translation, the sixth being given to a Biography, Bibliography, and General Index. The first volume is out, in the attractive form of the S.P.C.K. translations of Christian Literature (10s. net).

The translation is a delight to read—accurate without pedantry, free without looseness. Take a single paragraph:

'In the river Indus a worm is found resembling those which are usually found on fig-trees. Its average length is seven cubits, though some are longer, others shorter. It is so thick that a child ten years old could hardly put his arms round it. It has two teeth, one in the upper and one in the lower jaw. Everything it seizes with these teeth it devours. By day it remains in the mud of the river, but at night it comes out, seizes whatever it comes across, whether ox or camel, drags it into the river, and devours it all except the intestines. It is caught with a large hook baited with a lamb or kid attached by iron chains. After it has been caught, it is hung up for thirty days with vessels placed underneath, into which as much oil from the body drips as would fill ten Attic *kotylae*. At the end of the thirty days, the worm is thrown away, the vessels of oil are sealed and taken as a present to the king of India, who alone is allowed to use it. This oil sets everything alight—wood or animals—over which it is poured, and the flame can only be extinguished by throwing a quantity of thick mud on it.'

The verbatim report of *A Public Debate on 'The Truth of Spiritualism'* between Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Joseph McCabe has been published by Messrs. Watts (1s. net). It is not quite so futile as public debates usually are. It brings out glaringly the ignorance and indifference to truth of Sir Conan Doyle. Mr. McCabe evidently knows the subject a great deal better than this popular exponent of it.

The Holy Spirit and Christ.

By the Reverend John A. Hutton, D.D., Glasgow.

It will be a wise thing for us, for it will always safeguard religious life, defending it from the perils of mere ecstasy, to associate the work of the Holy Spirit directly with the influence of Jesus. There are those who indeed will identify these two. One of our foremost theologians, who only recently passed away, gave it as his own mature and considered opinion that the Holy Spirit of the New Testament is to be conceived simply as the supernatural impression and effluence of Jesus. For myself I do not take that position, although, to be perfectly frank, my mind is not one that quarrels with any one who takes such a position; and I welcome any statement which binds the work of the Holy Spirit to the real personality of Jesus Christ.

St. Paul, dealing, as I imagine he was, with controversies in the Corinthian Church, gave this ruling:

'For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.'

That is to say, men in his day were on one side and another talking of 'God,' each claiming to have the support of God. And what St. Paul in effect says is: 'The word God by itself is indecisive; it is like the algebraic "x"; it is the unknown. Any one can quote "God" as on his side, that is to say, the absolute.' 'And now,' he continues in effect, 'let us all understand that when a man in our community speaks of God, he means the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Such a man, therefore, when he claims the support of God for any position which he takes up or for any practice which he follows, must be able to show that that position which he takes up and that that practice which he follows are in harmony with the explicit guidance of Jesus Christ.' That is to say, Christ is the norm and the safeguard for all our thoughts about God; and so, I often say, the real question to-day is not, so to speak, the deity of Christ; it is the Christlikeness of God.

Now I think that point of view is of some assistance to us and helps us to see the wisdom, to say no more, which led the early Church to its doctrine of the Holy Ghost. It is an easy and cheap thing for enlightened men out in the world to scoff at some of those ancient formularies of the undivided Church, and to dismiss ancient controversies such as the 'Homoousion' and the 'Filioque' as idle logomachies; and yet when we approach these controversies with sympathy, we see that they were by no means idle. After all, the ancient world was rent in twain from Rome to Scythia over the question of the 'Homoousion'; and the whole religious world might one day be rent in twain over the doctrine of the 'Filioque.'

Our Creed declares that the Holy Ghost proceeds 'from the Father and the Son.' The phrase 'and the Son' I hold to be a safeguard so momentous that I believe it had the imprimatur of God.

Amending St. Paul's ruling in that Corinthian controversy in which he laid it down as a principle that *the heart of God is Christ*, and that when we of the Church speak of God we are to be understood as meaning the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, we want to say to-day that the heart of the Holy Ghost is Christ, and that any one who speaks about the Holy Spirit, about having the Holy Spirit, about manifesting the Holy Spirit, must be understood as meaning a Spirit which is in perfect harmony with the mind and character of the Lord Jesus Christ. There are many spirits, as an Apostle once put it, and we are to try them to see what is their essential nature.

I recall, from the lips of one of the most devout as he was one of the ablest ministers of our Church, now at rest with God, the story of an incident at the time of the Irish Revival in 1859, where, in the midst of a genuine outpouring of spiritual power, there were many make-believes and imitations. In a room in Belfast a woman was exhibited who was declared to be in a trance under the influence of the Holy Ghost. In a shaded room—we shall be wise always to suspect a religious influence which requires manipulated lights—she lay and upon her breast appeared

letters in fire, letters forming the word 'Jesus.' But, as he told me from whom I had the incident, which happened under his own eyes, and he himself, I repeat, was one of God's great saints, the word 'Jesus' was spelt wrongly: '*Jeesus.*' This was enough for my old friend, who there and then denounced the whole business, remarking that the Holy Ghost could surely spell the Name of Jesus correctly.

Now that is not only truth and fact: it is a parable. The sign of the Holy Ghost is that we spell 'Jesus' with ease and accuracy.

The Upsurge of Barbarism.

By the Reverend W. D. Niven, M.A., Aberdeen.

One is becoming rather tired of hearing and of saying—we have all said it—that the portentous unrest of our times with all its manifold variety is due to the late War. We are beginning to recollect that there was considerable evidence of most of the strange features of to-day before the War began. It is interesting to raise the question as to whether one cannot guess at some fact which might explain many at least of the characteristics of our present state, and account likewise for what was most unexpected and most appalling in the War itself.

I would suggest the idea that civilization has been for some time, and still is, suffering from an upsurge of barbarism. The barbarism of the War is only one part of the phenomenon, and, while it may have intensified other aspects of it, did not originate them.

Take what at first hearing may sound a ludicrous example, but on consideration may appear not without significance,—the matter of women's dress. In wealthy, 'smart' circles we find what is no doubt an unconscious, but none the less real, reversion towards barbaric fashion.

Take painting. It may be presumptuous for one whose art-education is of the slenderest to speak, but in such movements as Cubism there appears to the lay eye something reminiscent of barbaric ideas of representation. In music, Mr. Dooly's account of the modern orchestra as including buzz-saws and lawn-mowers is an exaggeration, but only an exaggeration of an undoubted tendency of an undoubtedly barbaric order.

In some modern poetry, with its proud defiance of all 'civilized' canons of versification and scansion, and in some of the new dances, we see the same tendency.

Take sexual morality. The War with its heavy emotional strain no doubt did much to cause an upset, but barbaric ideas on the subject were increasingly prevalent before its outbreak. In this field, indeed, civilization never has won a very decisive victory over the 'primitive,' and in recent times the 'primitive' have justified themselves on frankly primitive grounds, while we have also to note the place won for itself in American jurisprudence by the barbaric plea of an 'unwritten law,' which makes killing for infidelity no punishable offence. It is a fact of extraordinary interest that the recrudescence of barbaric morality, or from our view-point immorality, should be accompanied by a re-appearance of barbaric justice. Take our industrial unrest. It may be said that it is largely due to, or expressive of, the adoption of the good old barbaric principle:

> They should take who have the power,
> And they should keep who can.

Take Religion. Our day is marked by the strong recrudescence of certain elements highly characteristic of barbarian or savage thought, or the thought of the remote past. Theosophy makes us 'versed in Vedic lore.' Spiritualists of a certain order are finding joy unspeakable in reconstructing their psychic environment to the pattern of that of our far back barbarian ancestors. Sir A. Conan Doyle seriously suggests that in criminal inquiries the Police should be given the assistance of a 'medium'—a dignitary who in savage days was detective, chief witness, and counsel.

I do not mention many minor witnesses to the barbaric movement, the (pre-war) Druids of Paris may be named as a specimen. What has been said may suffice as a basis for my idea that we are passing through a time when by some means or

other Barbarism has re-appeared to challenge civilization on its most vital points.

If that be so, some interesting questions arise. How are we to conceive of this phenomenon? I speak of the *upsurge* of barbarism. It would, I think, be to misinterpret the facts to speak of a *return* to barbarism. With the exception of the Prussian mind as directed to warfare, I do not believe that the human mind has deliberately determined on an adoption of barbaric ideas or ideals. At least the vast majority of those who exemplify the renaissance of barbarism would be shocked at the mere idea that they were 'reverting.' Their idea is that they are exponents of the new, not of the age-old. One will be met with only amusement or scorn if one tells an ardent disciple of the 'newest' in religion that his view was hoary with age at the dawn of history. No, save in quite exceptional and pathological cases, there has been no deliberate or conscious return to barbarism. We must look at it in this way. The race has been civilized for a very short time compared with the very long ages of preceding savagery and barbarism. Just as the old habits of a converted and civilized savage or heathen individual will from time to time struggle to the surface, just as the habits of youth will sometimes re-assert themselves in a soberer middle-age, so the old habits of thought and morals of the race may seek for expression long after the race as a whole has grown out of them. Old habits may find expression when the mental and moral energies of the individual are somewhat 'run down,' and it is very conceivable that the pressure of life at the end of the nineteenth and the opening of the twentieth centuries produced this racial mental and moral fatigue which afforded an opening for the upsurge of old racial habits.

Once again, Psychology is beginning tentatively and cautiously, as is fitting, to recognize the existence, and tremendous possibilities if it does exist, of the subliminal or subconscious mind in the individual. According to the theory this subconscious mind forgets nothing. It keeps the whole of the past experience of the individual carefully in store. By laws which we cannot yet guess at, this subconscious mind sometimes interferes with or displaces the ordinary consciousness, in certain persons at least, if not in all. If we think of the race as an individual, then in the racial mind civilization represents the normal consciousness, but beneath this, and liable under certain circumstances to interfere with and displace it, lies all the race's long experience of barbarism. Thus the abnormality of racial mentality and morality appears no more difficult to explain than temporary abnormality in the individual, nor need it, if we take long views, fill us with more alarm.

But what about the Providential government of the world? What of the teleological aspect of this upsurge?

If we look back to the experience of the race, we find that civilization has repeatedly run a certain course and become effete and lifeless, only, however, to be replaced after a longer or shorter period of conflict and confusion by a civilization of a higher type. The agency by which this two-sided work of destruction and reconstruction was accomplished was very frequently a barbarian invasion. Why it should be so, it is in vain to ask. Sufficient for us to recognize that it has been so. That our civilization was tending to effeteness, that its great energies seemed to be 'running down,' was a familiar observation in the years preceding the War. The world was in such a condition that invasion of civilization by any barbarian race was unthinkable. But the old method of sweeping out and restoring was still available. There was barbarism underlying civilization everywhere. As I have tried to show, it was oozing upwards at many points. It found its main and striking vent in the War. No invasion by barbarian tribes could have dealt a heavier blow at civilization than the civilized race inflicted on itself. And we who believe in Providence and know something of what barbarian invasion meant for decadent civilization in the past, will look to the future of the race with hopefulness. The end of conflict is not yet, we cannot tell how long it may last. But we may be confident that 'the old order changeth, yielding place to new'; that the new will be better than the old, and that barbarism will once more prove to be, as it has often been before, the unwitting servant of human welfare.

In the Study.

Eli.

'Because his sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not.'—1 S 3^{13}.

Eli the high priest of Israel was descended from Ithamar the younger of the sons of Aaron. How the younger line of Ithamar came to be substituted for the elder line of Eleazar, we do not know. Eli would seem to have succeeded Abishua, of the older line of Eleazar; and there must have been some occurrence, involving failure on the part of Eleazar's descendants, and special favour towards the descendants of Ithamar, to account for an arrangement which violated the hereditary law that governed the transmission of the priesthood.

In the person of Eli were united for the first time in the history of Israel the two offices of high priest and judge. He is stated to have judged Israel forty years (1 S 4^{18}). Great things seem to have been expected of him, for if ever the office had a chance of fitting itself to the Theocracy and becoming the permanent form by which the Theocracy was to be worked, it was now when the civil and ecclesiastical power met in one man, and when personal merit and hereditary standing seemed to be combined in a single person. Eli is an interesting study, if only as an example of how a really good man may prove a failure.

I.

A Two-sided Character.

Eli had a good side and a bad side.

1. Look at his good side first. There was an entire absence of envy in him. He furthered Samuel's advancement and assisted it to his own detriment. Eli was the one in Israel to whom, naturally, a revelation should have come. God's priest and God's judge, to whom so fitly as to him could God send a message? But another is preferred: the inspiration comes to Samuel, and Eli is superseded and disgraced. Besides this, every conceivable circumstance of bitterness is added to his humiliation—God's message for all Israel comes to a boy: to one who had been Eli's pupil, to one beneath him, who had performed servile offices for him. This was the bitter cup put into his hand to drink. And Eli himself assisted Samuel to attain this dignity. He it was who perceived 'that God had called the child.' He did not say in petulance—'Then, let this favoured child find out for himself all he has to do, I will leave him to himself.' Eli meekly told him to go back to his place, instructed him how he was to accept the revelation, and appropriate it: 'Go, lie down: and it shall be, if he call thee, that thou shalt say, Speak, Lord; for thy servant heareth.' He conducted his rival to the presence chamber which by himself he could not find, and left him there with the King, to be invested with the order which has been stripped off himself.

It is a proverb, 'Humility comes through humiliations.' To make an act of humility might cost nothing. Mortifications from others do cost.[1]

(1) Eli's perception that it was God who spoke to Samuel must have had a pang in it. It is not easy for the old to recognize that the young hear God's voice more clearly than they, or for the superior to be glad when he is passed over and new truth dawns on the inferior. But, if there was any such feeling, it is silenced with beautiful self-abnegation, and he tells the wondering child the meaning of the voice and the answer he must make.

It may be that Eli had not forgotten the little injustice he had inadvertently done to Hannah, when he mistook her unwonted fervency in prayer for a sign of intoxication. How promptly and eagerly he accepted her explanation, and hastened to relieve her wounded spirit: 'No, my lord, I am a woman of a sorrowful spirit; I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink, but have poured out my soul before the Lord.' 'Then Eli answered and said, Go in peace; and the God of Israel grant thee thy petition that thou hast asked of him. And she said, Let thine handmaid find grace in thy sight. So the woman went her way, and did eat, and her countenance was no more sad.' Thus he turned her weeping into joy.

(2) Eli resolved to know the whole truth. He would not have Samuel leave out anything, out of regard to his feelings. He must know the whole, however painful it may be. He has learned to reverence God's truth, and cannot bear the idea of not knowing all. And Samuel, who did not wish to tell him anything, is now constrained to tell

[1] *Spiritual Letters of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, 316.

him the whole. He 'told him every whit, and hid nothing from him.' He did not shun to declare to him the whole counsel of God.

(3) He was resigned to the will of God. Looking at this aspect of Eli's character, we feel a reverence for the old man. When he was told that his house would be rooted up, that both his sons should die on one day, that the judgment of the Lord had set in against him and his successors, what did he say? He was nearly a hundred years old; his eyes were dim; for forty years he had maintained a position of supremacy. Men cannot easily throw away the traditions and the social consequence of so long-continued an elevation. Yet when the old man heard his doom, he said, 'It is the Lord: let him do what seemeth him good.' How many of us could have shown the same submissiveness, the same religious homage, under circumstances so terrible? An earthquake shaking the foundations of your house—a storm-cloud pouring out its flood upon your inheritance! Yet Eli was no vengeful priest in that hour; he was no mere self-seeker in that terrible day. Even then, when the foundations were rocking under his feet, and all the surroundings of his life were full of tempestuous and devouring elements, he said, with an old man's tremulous pathos, 'It is the Lord'—equal to, 'Let God be true, and every man a liar; He is sovereign, I am servant; whatsoever the Judge of the whole earth doeth shall be done in righteousness.'

'It is the Lord.' The highest religion could say no more. What more can there be than surrender to the Will of God? In that one brave sentence you forget all Eli's vacillation. Free from envy, earnest, humbly submissive—that is the bright side of Eli's character, and the side least known or thought of.[1]

Resignation is too often conceived to be merely a submission, not unattended with complaint, to what we have no power to avoid. But it is less than the whole of a work of a Christian. Your full triumph as far as that particular occasion of duty is concerned will be to find that you not merely repress inward tendencies to murmur—but that you would not if you could alter what in any matter God has plainly willed. . . . Here is the great work of religion; here is the path through which sanctity is attained, the highest sanctity; and yet it is a path evidently to be traced in the course of our daily duties.[2]

2. Greater prominence is given in the Bible to the other side of Eli's character.

(1) Our attention is turned to the gross wickedness and scandalous behaviour of Eli's sons. There are many dark pictures in the history of Israel in the time of the Judges—pictures of idolatry, pictures of lust, pictures of treachery, pictures of bloodshed; but there is none more awful than the picture of the high priest's family at Shiloh. In the other cases members of the nation had become grossly wicked; but in this case it is the salt that has lost its savour—it is those who should have led the people in the ways of God that have become the ringleaders of the devil's army. Hophni and Phinehas take their places in that unhonoured band where the names of Alexander Borgia and many a high ecclesiastic of the Middle Ages send forth their stinking savour.

Eli knew what was going on and dealt with the state of things in the worst possible way. He spoke against it, but he did not act against it. 'I hear,' he said to his sons, 'of your evil dealings from all this people. Ye make the Lord's people to transgress.' The scandal went on. When the ark was sent to the camp, it was accompanied by Hophni and Phinehas. And every Israelite knew that, if Hophni continued to hold his present position, he would at no distant date sit in the seat of Aaron. Eli only talked to his sons; and we can understand how he may have persuaded himself that this was enough: that instead of making a painful resolution, it was better to leave matters alone. If he were to do more, was there not a risk that he might forfeit the little influence over the young men that still remained to him? Would not harsh treatment defeat its object, by making them desperate? Might they not attribute the most judicial severity to mere personal annoyance? If, after speaking to them, he left them alone, they would think over his words. Anyhow, they would soon be older; and as they grew older they would, he may have hoped, grow more sensible; they would see the imprudence and impropriety as well as the graver aspects of their conduct; they would anticipate the need for action on their father's part by a reformation of manners which would hush the murmurs and allay the discontent of Israel. And even if this could not be calculated on very securely, something might occur to give a new turn to their occupations; in any case, it might be better to wait and see whether matters would not in some way right themselves.

How this sin of Eli's, in his treatment of his sons, commenced, we cannot tell; probably in

[1] F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, 4th ser., 10.

[2] J. Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, i. 216.

their early childhood, when their evil dispositions began to show themselves, and he spared the rod and withheld correction. What his sin was, is very precisely pointed out;—'he restrained them not.' Doubtless he taught them; surely he prayed for them; he certainly exhibited to them the example of a holy and blameless life;—but he restrained them not. At first, he might have restrained them with, comparatively, a very gentle hand: a firm voice, a decided look, might have been enough; a few instances of patient, persevering determination, with an absence of all angry passion provoking them to wrath, might have taught the little rebels how hopeless it was to think of making their father yield to them; judicious kindness, not being bitter against them, would have made them feel the relief and gladness of yielding to him; and thereafter he might have guided them with his eye. Failing at that first stage to form in them the habit of obedience, Eli's task became of course more difficult as his sons grew in strength and stature, as well as in force of will. The waywardness and impetuosity of early youth, succeeding to the insubordination of spoiled and fondled childhood, presented a stouter aspect of resistance or defiance.

Self-government with tenderness—here you have the condition of all authority over children. The child must discover in us no passion, no weakness of which he can make use; he must feel himself powerless to deceive or to trouble us; then he will recognize in us his natural superiors, and he will attach a special value to our kindness, because he will respect it.[1]

The rod produces an effect which terminates in itself. A child is afraid of being whipped, and gets his task, and there's an end on't.[2]

(2) It is true that Eli was a decrepit old man, from whom much vigour of action could not have been expected. But even if he was old and decrepit when the actual state of things first burst on his view, there was enough of the awful in the conduct of his sons to have roused him to unwonted activity. David was old and decrepit, lying feebly at the edge of death, when word was brought to him that Adonijah had been proclaimed king in place of Solomon, for whom he had destined the throne. But there was enough of the startling in this intelligence to bring back a portion of its youthful fire to David's heart, and set him to devise the most vigorous measures to prevent the mischief that was so ready to be perpetrated. Fancy King David sending a meek message to Adonijah—'Nay, my son, it is not on your head but on Solomon's that my crown is to rest; go home, my son, and do nothing more in a course hurtful to yourself and hurtful to your people.' But it was this foolish and most inefficient course that Eli took with his sons. Had he acted as he should have acted at the beginning, matters would never have come to such a flagrant pass. But when the state of things became so terrible, there was but one course that should have been thought of. When the wickedness of the acting priests was so outrageous that men abhorred the offering of the Lord, the father ought to have been sunk in the high priest; the men who had so dishonoured their office should have been driven from the place, and the very remembrance of the crime they had committed should have been obliterated by the holy lives and holy service of better men. It was inexcusable in Eli to allow them to remain. If he had had a right sense of his office he would never for one moment have allowed the interest of his family to outweigh the claims of God.

For what were the interests of his sons compared with the credit of the national worship? What mattered it that the sudden stroke would fall on them with startling violence? If it did not lead to their repentance and salvation it would at least save the national religion from degradation, and it would thus bring benefit to tens of thousands in the land. All this Eli did not regard. He could not bring himself to be harsh to his own sons. He could not bear that they should be disgraced and degraded. He would satisfy himself with a mild remonstrance, notwithstanding that every day's new disgrace was heaped on the sanctuary, and new encouragement given to others to practise wickedness, by the very men who should have been foremost in honouring God, and sensitive to every breath that would tarnish His name.

I should almost dare to say there are five generous men to one just man. The beauty of justice is the beauty of simple form; the beauty of generosity is heightened with colour and every accessory. The passions will often ally themselves with generosity, but they always tend to divert from justice. The man who strongly loves justice must love it for its own sake, and such a love makes of itself a character of a simple grandeur to which it is hard to find an equal.[3]

[1] *Amiel's Journal*, 35.
[2] Johnson.
[3] J. Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, ii. 640.

(3) 'The best things when corrupted become the worst.' It is thus with official positions such as were held by the priests of old. Their positions were an hereditary right, and their duties consisted largely of a prescribed routine of services. It was required, however, that their personal character should accord with their sacred work (Mal 2^7); and their influence was great for good or evil. Whilst they reflected in their character and conduct the moral condition of the times, they also contributed in no small degree to produce it. The sons of Eli employed their high office not for the welfare of men and the glory of God, but for their own selfish and corrupt purposes, and afford an example of 'great and instructive wickedness.' They were unspiritual men, and practically infidel. And they were such notwithstanding the instructions they received, the opportunities they possessed, and the services they rendered. Although the servants of God, 'they knew not God,' and were 'without excuse.' Not satisfied with the liberal portions of the peace offerings which were legally assigned to them (the breast and shoulder), they claimed other and larger portions, to which they were not entitled, and robbed the people for the gratification of their own appetites. What they would have fiercely denounced in others they deemed venial offences in privileged men like themselves. It was required by the Levitical law that the fat should be burnt on the altar before the offering was divided between the priest and the offerer; but instead of doing this, the priest sent his servant beforehand to demand his portion with the fat, that it might be better fitted for roasting than boiling, which was not to his taste. He thus appropriated to his private use what belonged to the Lord, and 'robbed God' of His due.

(4) Eli's feebleness arose out of original temperament. His feelings were all good: his acts were all wrong. In sentiment Eli might always be trusted: in action he was for ever false, because he was a weak, vacillating man. Therefore his virtues were all of a negative character. He was forgiving to his sons, because unable to feel strongly the viciousness of sin; free from jealousy, because he had no keen affections; submissive, because too indolent to feel rebellious. Before we praise a man for his excellences, we must be quite sure that they do not rise out of so many defects. No thanks to a proud man that he is not vain. No credit to a man without love that he is not jealous: he has not strength enough for passion.

All history overrates such men. Men like Eli ruin families by instability, produce revolutions, die well when only passive courage is wanted, and are reckoned martyrs. They live like children, and die like heroes. Deeply true to nature and exceedingly instructive is this history of Eli. It is quite natural that such men should suffer well. For if only their minds are made up for them by inevitable circumstances, they can submit. When people come to Eli and say, 'You should reprove your sons,' he can do it after a fashion; when it is said to him, 'You must die,' he can make up his mind to die: but this is not *taking* up the cross.

There was one peculiarity in Goethe's nature, namely, a singular hesitation in adopting any decisive course of action—singular, in a man so resolute and imperious when once his decision had been made. This is the weakness of imaginative men. However strong the volition, when once it is set going, there is in men of active intellects, and especially in men of imaginative, apprehensive intellects, a fluctuation of motives keeping the volition in abeyance, which practically amounts to weakness; and is only distinguished from weakness by the strength of the volition when let loose. Goethe, who was aware of this peculiarity, used to attribute it to his never having been placed in circumstances which required prompt resolutions, and to his not having educated his will; but I believe the cause lay much deeper, lying in the nature of psychological actions, not in the accidents of education.[1]

(5) There can be no more fatal guide to a man setting out in life than the instinct which chooses what is agreeable, and avoids everything that is harsh and difficult. Many a graceful, amiable, and well-intentioned youth has thus reached an end of infamy. The character which shrinks from all collision with other men, which cannot face obloquy, which shrinks from inflicting pain, not because it hurts other people so much as because it shakes one's own nerves, which does all in its power to preserve the belief that this life is before all else for comfort and pleasure—this character is one of the most dangerous that wanders over this earth, dangerous for itself and dangerous for others also. Its apparent gentleness and goodness in the beginning arise mainly from the gaiety and good spirits of youth, and from the desire to stand well with everybody, which very desire will ultimately entangle him with sin, and devastate his life. There are times in most lives when the current of circumstances sets strongly towards sin, and when

[1] G. H. Lewes, *The Life of Goethe*, 492.

a man will certainly sin if his rule of life has been to avoid all that is painful, and to choose what will for the time give him security and ease. The life of such a man, however promising it seems in youth, becomes weighted and entangled by a constantly accumulating burden of difficulties and sorrowful remembrances, and unavailing regrets, until at last he is, like Eli, almost glad to hear that what he has so long seen must be a losing game is over, and that his doom is imminent.

There was a man to whom I was very near, so that I could see a great deal of his life, who made almost every one fond of him, for he was young and clever and beautiful, and his manners to all were gentle and kind. I believe, when I first knew him, he never thought of anything cruel or base. But because he tried to slip away from everything that was unpleasant, and cared for nothing else so much as his own safety, he came at last to commit some of the basest deeds—such as make men infamous. He denied his father, and left him to misery; he betrayed every trust that was reposed in him, that he might keep himself safe and get rich and prosperous. Yet calamity overtook him.[1]

II.

Divine Discipline.

1. We see in this story, the terribleness of God's displeasure. 'I will do a thing in Israel, at which both the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle. . . . I have told him that I will judge his house for ever for the iniquity which he knoweth. . . . I have sworn unto the house of Eli, that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor offering for ever.'

In a great battle, fought with the Philistines, the Israelites were defeated with the loss of about four thousand men. It was a serious blow, and produced deep searchings of heart among the elders. 'Wherefore,' said they, 'hath the Lord smitten us to-day before the Philistines?' In their perplexity, they resolved to fetch the Ark of the Covenant out of Shiloh, thinking that, by some magic influence, it would help them to retrieve their fortunes in the field. Hophni and Phinehas joined in this impious freak, and we may suppose that Eli himself gave his sanction. It often happens that the most profane persons are the most superstitious; those who live in habitual forgetfulness of God are apt to lay great store by omens, witchcraft, and even paltry charms; and to these misguided men the Ark of the Covenant meant little more than that. But they soon discovered that the symbol of the Divine presence was of no avail, when the reality was withdrawn.

[1] George Eliot, *Romola*, ii. 388.

Dragging the ark thither only removed God farther away. We need not be too hard upon these people; for the natural disposition of us all is to trust to the externals of worship, and to put a punctilious attention to these in the place of a true cleaving of heart to the God who dwells near us, and is in us and on our side, if we cling to Him with penitent love. Even God-appointed symbols become snares.

It was on March 21st, 1877, that, being full of St. Benedict as portrayed by Montalembert, and also in a peculiarly hopeless state about my own reform, straight in the teeth of my Protestant conscience, I prayed to the Saint, if perchance he might hear or help. I had really no faith in what I was doing, but clutched as a drowning man will at a straw. As well as I can remember I was reading Compline (as I did then at my night prayers) and had stopped in the middle of a psalm, by way of distraction, to make this experiment. I resumed in due course at the words: 'Quoniam in me speravit, liberabo eum; protegam eum quoniam cognovit nomen meum; clamabit ad me et ego exaudiam eum; cum ipso sum in tribulatione, eripiam eum et glorificabo eum,' etc. etc. I have lived on that, and two or three similar coincidences ever since.[2]

2. Is there in poetry or drama a more vivid and pathetic passage than the closing verses of this narrative, which tell of the panting messenger and the old blind Eli? 'Eben-ezer' cannot have been very far from Shiloh, for the fugitive had seen the end of the fight, and reached the city before night. He came with the signs of mourning, and, as it would appear from v.[18], passed the old man at the gate without pausing, and burst into the city with his heavy tidings. One can almost hear the shrill shrieks of wrath and despair which first told Eli that something was wrong. Blind and unwieldy and heavy-hearted, he sat by the gate to which the news would first come; but yet he is the last to hear—perhaps because all shrank from telling him, perhaps because in the confusion no one remembered him. Only after he had asked the meaning of the tumult, of which his foreboding heart and conscience told him the meaning before it was spoken, is the messenger brought to the man to whom he should have gone first. How touchingly the story pauses, even at this crisis, to paint the poor old man! A stronger word is used to describe his blindness than in 1 S 3[2], as the

[2] *Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell*, i. 122.

Revised Version shows. His fixed eyeballs were sightless now; and there he sat, dreading and longing to hear. The fugitive's account of himself is shameless in its avowal of his cowardice, and prepares Eli for the worst. But note how he speaks gently and with a certain dignity, crushing down his anxiety—'How went the matter, my son?' Then, with no merciful circumlocution or veiling, out comes the whole dismal story.

The Divine symbol, with its overshadowing cherubim and its sacred light, into which year by year Eli had gone alone to sprinkle the blood of atonement on the mercy-seat, and where he had solemnly transacted with God on behalf of the people, was in an enemy's hands! The ark, that no Canaanite or Amalekite had ever touched, on which no Midianite or Ammonite had ever laid his polluted finger, which had remained safe and sure in Israel's custody through all the perils of their journeys and all the storms of battle, was now torn from their grasp! And there perishes with it all the hope of Israel, and all the sacred service which was associated with it; and Israel is a widowed, desolate, godless people, without hope and without God in the world; and all this has come because they dragged it away from its place, and these two sons of Eli's, now gone to their account, encouraged the profanation!

3. Of the utter ruin of Eli's household we need not speak. The priesthood passes away from his family; the government is upon other shoulders; his seed are a beggared race. The last incident recorded concerning his children is most profoundly touching; it is the birth of his grandson, the child of his son Phinehas. The unhappy mother hears of her husband Phinehas, fallen in the disastrous fight; and of her father-in-law Eli, suddenly dead. She cannot stand the shock. She bows her head, and the pangs of premature travail are upon her. The women about her say, 'Fear not; for thou hast born a son.' But there is no joy for her because a man-child is born into the world. She is a godly woman, broken-hearted by the sin and fate of an ungodly husband. She is like-minded with her husband's godly father, Eli. When the women tell her of the son she has born, 'she answered not, neither did she regard it.' But with her dying breath she named the child 'Ichabod'; for she said 'the glory is departed from Israel: because the ark of God was taken.'

The whole house of Eli is a ruin: the priesthood degraded; the nation defeated; the ark taken; and, amid the wreck, his own family broken up, and the sole survivor launched on the stream of time with an ominous name, and under a heavy curse. And all this in connexion with one of the meekest and holiest of the saints of God! It is a terrible lesson. And in keeping with it is the lesson taught by the melancholy notice of his own decease.

When the law of moral consequences is recognized as fixed and absolute, the hope to escape from it would be as great madness as to resist the law of gravitation. George Eliot's best known expression of this law is in *Romola*: 'Our deeds are like our children that are born to us; they live and act apart from our own will. Nay, children may be strangled, but deeds never: they have an indestructible life both in and out of our own consciousness.' This is the old Buddhist doctrine of Karma. St. Paul had put it still more briefly: 'Be not deceived: God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.'[1]

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'And turning to the disciples, he said privately, Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see.'—Lk 10^{23}.

There are many lovely homes in England, but few so beautiful as that in which Alfred Tennyson was born on a summer day in 1809. He was one of a large family—there were twelve children altogether—and the father was rector of a village church in Lincolnshire.

The Tennyson boys and girls had a very happy time. The boys were specially fond of games. But books were really their chief amusement; when the leaves were off the trees and the winds blew and the trees swayed and cracked they would tell each other stories. Alfred was the best of them all at romancing. One story of his lasted for months; it was called 'The Old Horse.'

Alfred loved his mother very dearly. From her he inherited his love of animals and his pity for 'wounded things.' She was a very religious woman. Long afterwards when he had become a great man, he said, 'She was the beautifulest thing that God Almighty ever made.'

You have, I feel sure, heard people speak of certain boys and girls as having an ear for music. When he was just a wee fellow—five years old—Alfred Tennyson heard music in the wind. A storm was sweeping through the Rectory garden;

[1] C. Gardner, *The Inner Life of George Eliot*, 117.

he ran from the house stretching out his little arms and crying,

'I hear a voice that's speaking in the wind.'

No wonder that he began to love poetry early. He heard music in the words of it. His brother Charles, who was rather older, did the same. When they were fifteen and seventeen years of age, they together issued a volume of poems, and Charles told afterwards how on the afternoon of its publication he and Alfred hired a carriage with some of the money earned, drove to their favourite seashore and shared their triumph with the wind and the waves.

You boys and girls know what it is to form a friendship apart from your brothers and sisters. Well, the Tennyson brothers went to Trinity College, Cambridge, to study, and there Alfred found a great friend in a fellow-student whose name was Arthur Hallam. He was very clever indeed and good as well. One meets boys, and girls too, who can never bring themselves to be enthusiastic over the work of a companion, or to listen in a good spirit when any friend tells them their faults.

Arthur Hallam looked up to Tennyson as to an older brother, yet he was his critic. He could praise his friend's work or he could condemn it, and all the time the two loved each other even as David and Jonathan did.

Arthur Hallam died when he was twenty-two. Tennyson felt very very sad, but through constantly remembering that he was loved by his friend a new thought was born in his mind. That thought grew until by and by Death did not any longer mean to him separation from his beloved friend, but rather the gate to a higher and better life that was nearer to Arthur Hallam because nearer to God.

He wrote down his thoughts in a great poem called *In Memoriam*. That poem not only crowned him a king among poets, it spoke of God's love to those who could not always feel sure about it. Grown men and women spoke to each other of the new and brighter outlook. It was like seeing a halo of light where the gloom of death used to be. And so Tennyson became not merely a poet, but, through the love of a friend, the preacher of a gospel of gladness.

Many of you here know him only as the poet who wrote 'The May Queen.' It is a touching story told in words that make music: you want to hear it again and again. You almost feel that you know the little May Queen, who came to be sure of God's love when she was very very ill. Tennyson loved her, he loved all little children, and had the heart of a child himself. When he was quite an old man he was made a Peer. Henceforth he was known as Lord Tennyson; but at eighty years of age the Peer remained the little child. We know that from a beautiful little poem he wrote then. He was thinking about death, for he was feeble and tired. But he was not afraid. The child's trusting heart was always there—don't you recognize it?

I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.

He was afraid his son would not quite understand who the 'Pilot' was, so he explained Him as being 'That Divine and Unseen who is always guiding us'; who is guiding you, boys and girls.

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark;
For, tho' from out our bourne of time and place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crost the bar.

When you read or sing 'Crossing the Bar,' you will feel that the writer of it was a friend of yours—will you not?

'People, be Dood.'

'Who went about doing good.'—Ac 10^{38}.

Some of the boys and girls here know the name of John Ruskin. You know that he was a great writer and teacher of last century, and that the things he wrote were wise and beautiful and noble. Now I want to tell you about the first sermon John Ruskin ever preached. How old do you think he was when he preached it? Just three years! And what do you think he said?—'People, be dood. If you are dood, Dod will love you. If you are

not dood, Dod will not love you. People, be dood.'

Well, Ruskin was not much more than a baby then, and he didn't understand one of the most wonderful facts—that God loves us even when we are naughty, that He loves us all the time. Nevertheless I think it was very good advice that baby Ruskin gave, 'People be good'; and so I am going to say to you to-day, 'People, be good; boys and girls, be good.'

But what does being good mean? There have been many different ideas about that. Once upon a time men thought that to be good they must shut themselves away from the world. And some of them lived as hermits in dens and caves of the mountains and gave themselves up to fasting and reading holy books and saying long prayers. That was not Jesus' way. We read of His going apart into a desert place to pray, but that was only that He might talk with His Father and renew His strength for the work God had given Him to do. Jesus' way of being good was doing good. Our text tells us that He 'went about doing good'—not just thinking about it, or talking about it, but *doing* it. And so the best way to *be* good is to *do* good.

The other day I read a story about a father who was going from home for a short time, and as he was taking leave of his small son he said, 'Good-bye; be good.' 'Right-o, Father,' replied the small boy. A few days later father returned from his travels and his first question was, 'Well, Tommy, have you been a good boy?' 'Oh yes, Father,' was Tommy's prompt reply. But father had once been a boy himself, so he thought he would inquire a little further into matters. 'Well now, Tommy, did you do as your mother bade you?' Tommy was a truthful small boy, so he owned up that he hadn't always. 'And were you kind to Alec?' (Alec was the small brother.) 'Well, one day he made me awful mad and I struck him.' 'Then how do you make out that you were good?' 'Well, you see, one day I heard another boy say a bad word and I smacked him on the mouth.'

Tommy's father was wiser the next time he went from home. Instead of telling his son to be good, this is what he said, 'Do what your mother tells you, be kind to your small brother, speak the truth, and play fair.' That is the kind of thing that doing good means.

You know the world is made up of a great many different kinds of people, in fact there are about as many different kinds as there are people, but if we judge people by their deeds, I think there are four main classes.

1. First there are those who go about *doing harm.* I hope none of you belong to that class, for there are a few boys and girls in it as well as grown-ups. Wherever these people go they have a bad influence. If they get into a school, the whole tone of the school is lowered. If there are any such in your school don't have anything to do with them. You can be quite agreeable to them, but don't make them your chums or listen to their talk.

2. And then there are those who go about the world *doing mischief.* They are not intentionally bad these people. Very often they just mean to have a little fun. And so long as the mischief doesn't hurt others, there isn't much harm in it. But mischief has an unfortunate way of hurting others in a way we never thought of. For the mischievous people are generally the thoughtless people. Now I'm not going to mention the different kinds of mischief, because you know them just as well as I do, and if I happened to mention a particular kind you hadn't thought of, you might want to go and try it straight away. But I just want to say this. If you do wish a little fun and nonsense, try to choose the kind that doesn't hurt other people.

3. The third kind of people go about the world *doing nothing.* I don't mean to say that they are absolutely idle. Some of them are very busy indeed. Some are very busy making money, others are very busy enjoying themselves. But for all that they do to make the world better or happier or more beautiful, they might just as well not have lived.

There was a Roman Emperor once called Titus. And if he did not right some wrong or do some good thing each day he used to say to his courtiers, 'Alas! I have lost a day.'

Titus was only a heathen, but I think he might have put to shame many people who live in Christian lands. Don't be a 'do-nothing.' God sends us each day as a beautiful gift, and we must see to it that we make good use of it. What are you doing with your gift?

4. But lastly, there are the people who go about *doing good.* That was what Jesus did, and if we want to learn how to do good we must look to Him.

What kind of good did Jesus do? He made sick people well, He made sad people glad, He made bad people good. We can help to make sick people well, by being kind to them when they are ill, and by giving our pennies to the hospitals where the sick people are cared for. We can help to make sad people glad by a smile or a word or a loving look. We can help to make bad people good. How did Jesus do it? By being good Himself, by believing the best about them, and by loving them. And we can help to make people good in the same way—by living a beautiful life, by believing the best about others, and by loving them.

God has a big work to do in the world, and every little kind and helpful and unselfish and loving thing you do helps it on. Wouldn't you like to be God's helpers?

Somebody did a golden deed:
Somebody proved a friend in need:
Somebody sang a beautiful song:
Somebody smiled the whole day long:
Somebody thought, 'Tis sweet to live':
Somebody said, 'I'm glad to give':
Somebody fought a brave, good fight:
Somebody loved to help the right:
Was that somebody you?

Hidden Rocks.

'Hidden rocks.'—Jude 12.

What is the greatest treat when you are on holiday at the seaside? Paddling? No; better than that! Building sand castles? No; more exciting than that! Swimming? No; even jollier than that! What, then? Why, going for a row in a boat, of course! That is 'top hole' as you boys say, especially if you are allowed to steer for a bit, or take an oar occasionally. If you add to these joys the joy of dangling a line over the side of the boat and catching fish to fry for tea, you will agree with me that an outing like that is hard to beat. When you go for such a row I have a piece of advice to give you, and it is this. Take an old sailor man with you. Why? For two very good reasons—the first of which is that if you want to fish he will show you the best fishing ground; the second, that he will keep you clear of our text. Our text, like strong currents, is one of the dangers of going for a row on a coast you do not know. If you wish to find out what that danger is turn up the Revised Version of the Bible at the second last book, the Epistle of Jude. In the twelfth verse you will find two words, 'hidden rocks,' and in these two words you have both the text and the danger.

Any sailor will tell you that hidden rocks are one of the worst dangers of an unknown coast. Sometimes you can tell that they are there from the white line of foam which breaks over them, and at very low tide you may see their black tops showing above water. Sometimes the water is perfectly calm and smiling above them, and there is no sign to tell you that they are beneath. But if the sun be shining and the water clear, lean over the side of the boat and you will catch a glimpse of their dark forms. You will notice that some are sharp and jagged like the teeth of a saw, others are rounded or covered with a thick coat of seaweed; but you feel that though they may look different they are all capable of knocking a very nasty hole in the bottom of your frail boat. Sometimes the channel between their hungry teeth is so narrow that the boat has to be steered very carefully to get you safely through. You are not so keen on holding the tiller then; you are only too thankful to hand it over to some one who knows the passage.

Boys and girls, the sea is not the only place where we find hidden rocks. We find them in everyday life; and the rocks we find there are even more dangerous than those to be found in the ocean. Strange to say, too, the hidden rocks of life, like the hidden rocks of the sea, are of two kinds. The first show a path of white above them. They hoist a danger signal. But the second are so hidden that we cannot tell they are there till suddenly one day a flash of light reveals them to us.

1. Now, for the first kind—those that hoist a danger signal. These are, I think, the wrong things that we know quite well we should not do, yet straightway go and do them. We know that they are dangerous, but we deliberately run our little boat on to them. What would you say of a sailor who steered straight for the foam that marked a hidden reef? You would call him either mad, or foolish, or both. Well, when you know a thing is wrong and yet do it, let me assure you you are equally mad and foolish.

Of course I know that often it is more difficult

to steer away from the rocks than to steer to them. People who want you to do wrong have a peculiarly maddening way of daring you to do it, and hinting that you are a coward if you refuse. When you come across such people, remember this. It is more splendid to be a moral hero than a merely physical hero. It is more splendid to turn a deaf ear to taunts and refuse to do what conscience whispers to be wrong, than it is to yield to mockings. Conscience is the foam on the hidden rock, and if we disregard it we deserve shipwreck. To run headlong into danger or temptation is no sign of bravery.

A gentleman once wished to engage a coachman. He had a number of applications from good men. How do you think he chose among them? He took them all to a certain road which lay between a hill on the right side, and a precipice on the left; and he asked each in turn how close to the edge of the precipice he could drive. One man said he thought he could drive within a foot, another said within nine inches, and a third was certain he could drive within six inches. The last man said, 'I should keep as far from the edge as I possibly could,' and the gentleman promptly engaged him.

2. What about the second kind of hidden rocks? I think these are like the many things we do every day without realizing that they are wrong. They lie hidden so deep in our heart and are so well concealed that we never suspect their existence; and just because we don't know of them, just because they hoist no danger signal, they are all the more dangerous. Lots of us would be tremendously surprised if we saw how selfish we were. We always thought that was just standing up for our rights. We should be surprised, and shocked too, to learn that we were mean and greedy. We always imagined we were just taking our share of the good things of life. Then others of us would be astonished to find that we were spiteful and revengeful, we had always thought that was merely paying people back in their own coin. Perhaps a few of us had been thinking ourselves perfect and patting our own backs and despising others, but we called that self-respect and did not think how hideous a fault it was. Boys and girls, look into your hearts to-day. Ask God to flash some of His own light into their darkness and discover to you their hidden faults.

Then, having discovered them, set about getting rid of them with His help. You know what is done to dangerous rocks in a harbour channel. They are blasted out with gunpowder. That is what we must do with the hidden rocks in our heart. We must blast them out; and we must ask God to help us to do it, for we shall never get rid of them without His aid.

The Christian Year.

Sixth Sunday after Trinity.

The Preacher as Prophet.

'Whom shall I send?'—Is 6^{8}.

Those truths about God, those thoughts about life, which are to interpret men to themselves and God to men—how does the prophet attain to them? The answer, implied in the very name of prophet, is that he receives them from God. But let us look into this answer and see what it means. For there is a danger of superstition here, and of much loose and indefinite thinking. There is nothing magical in the reception of God's word by the prophet. In His communications with men, God uses regular and ascertainable means of imparting His message to them. Of course there are occasional exceptions to all such rules as this—eccentricities of inspiration, some of which may be quite beyond our power of explaining or analysing. But the normal process is clear. A man begins with *experience and study*; out of these rise *visions* of certain truths which are specially direct and certain; finally, these truths grow more and more imperative in their demand that he shall proclaim them, and that is the preacher's *call*.

1. *Experience.*—In order to be a true prophet, the preacher must know God and find out the truth about life, not by hearsay, but in his own experience. It is for his own soul that he must first find interpretations. He must drink deep draughts of life, living intensely and strenuously. Some prophets have written the message that they sent forth in their own hearts' blood, and no message has ever been or will ever be very convincing that has not a dash of the prophet's blood upon it. Behind every prophet's preaching there lies his wilderness, where he has fought alone with devils and been aware of the presence of both wild beasts and angels. There he must have wrestled with doubt until his thinking grew clear and articu-

late; he must have fought for character against temptation. So when he comes forth to men, he must ever seem to meet them as one who is fighting their battle on ground where he has won his own.

2. Along with experience there must be *study*, especially in an age like this, when the preacher's task is to interpret God and life to men who are reading widely for themselves. The message given to a preaching man is not a spontaneous and independent revelation, which would be identically the same whether he had read anything or not. Only extremists will tell you that the preacher ought simply to depend upon the guidance of the Spirit at the moment, and that diligence in preparation is incompatible with the prophetic ideal. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Every book read will contribute to the message, and become part of the inspiration of the Spirit. The opposite view corresponds exactly to that of the plenary and *verbatim* inspiration of the Scriptures in its crudest form, the relation between the Spirit and the man whom He inspires being simply that of flute-player and flute. The prophets of the Bible used for their prophesying every means of education available in their times and circumstances. Each of them was the child of the past as he knew it, and his knowledge of it, and of all else that he knew, can be traced in the things which he said. The modern study of the developing consciousness of Jesus is founded upon the presupposition that the same principle applies to the utterances even of the Saviour Himself. The fact is that there is no such phenomenon as a prophet receiving a message which is not affected, and so far limited, by his own knowledge acquired in ordinary ways. God does not give us revelations regarding matters of fact which our own study ought to give us; but if we shall be at pains to acquire knowledge, God will show us its bearings and its use. Study is not only compatible with prophetic utterance: it is absolutely essential to it. He who would aspire to the high office of the prophet must serve his apprenticeship as a humble and faithful student.

3. *Vision.* — Experience and study are not enough. Neither the man of experience nor the man of books is necessarily a prophet. There must be a selection among the various ideas and impulses gathered in these two ways—a selection not made voluntarily by the preacher, but made *in* him by a higher Power. Of all his varied gatherings, some will become different from the rest—more inevitable, more urgent. 'The first thing that is necessary in an orator,' says Hichens, 'if he is to be successful with an audience, is confidence in himself, a conviction that he has something to say which is worth saying, which has to be said.' This confidence will be found to attach itself not to the whole of any man's discourse, but to a certain part of it which includes only the man's enthusiastic convictions. These detach themselves from the rest of his opinions, and become a kind of intuitive and brilliant group of certainties, which form the core or nucleus of his thinking. Such groups may well come under the name of vision, for the note of them is their certainty and directness of truth. Regarding these, John Bunyan writes: 'I could not be contented with saying, "I believe and am sure"; methought I was more than sure.'

4. There is one thing more in the full equipment of the prophet, and that is his *call*. Vision by itself does not constitute a call. A man may find certain groups of ideas rise within him to such brilliance as to assume the absolute mastery over his life, and to become 'the light of all his seeing,' and yet he may feel no call to proclaim those ideas to others. A vision becomes a call only when there comes upon the man who has received it a passionate desire to impart it to others. It is when vision becomes imperative, when a man must either speak out or break his heart, when he cannot be content with holding convictions but must strive to make them the convictions of others, that his call has come.[1]

Seventh Sunday after Trinity.

Lift up your Eyes.

'Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest.'—Jn 4^{35}.

The vision that floats before me is a vast synthesis of all the experience which the human race has ever had or ever will have had.

1. First, we must have full trust in reason to verify and define the facts of that experience. The Agnostic is out of court, whether he calls himself a Christian or something else. We shall want everything that philosophy can tell us of the working of the divine within us, the whole teaching of science about its working in the world, the

[1] J. Kelman, *The War and Preaching*.

most searching criticism to unravel its course in history; and we shall need the highest of culture to throw over all the divine charm of grace and beauty.

2. But this is not enough: no man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. No one man born in sin can reach the many-sided fulness of truth. We need a deeper social science to set our relations to each other in a fuller light of truth, and to shape our society more after the dim outline of that kingdom of God which every Theist must believe in, though he may not call it by a Christian name.

3. But this again is not enough. As no one man can cover the divine expanse of truth, so neither can any one nation. After all the advances we boast of in our civilization, we have inherited by far the largest part of it from the past. History was old when the Pyramids were built, Greece and Israel already stand on the platform of an ancient civilization, and every generation has added to the august tradition which is now the common heritage of cultured nations. But Asia must help us too. It is impossible that the new-born energy of Japan should never have anything better to teach us than the mere craft of war. The ancient wisdom of India may well have a new career before it, now that we ourselves have made for ever vain her immemorial barriers of the Indus and the desert. More than this, I can well believe that some of the noblest work of a not distant future may come from peoples on whose ancestors we ourselves look down as proudly as of old imperial Rome looked down upon our own.

4. Can we stop here? Is not all this enough? Certainly it is not. All this may be vast and grand; but all this as yet is dead. We may have philosophy and science, criticism and culture in perfection, and a finely organized society too, and still have no life in us. But where shall the spark of life be found? The deep saith, It is not in me; the sea saith, It is not with me: yet it is found in the land of the living. Now you must not mistake me if I tell you what it is. The spark of life is mysticism. I do not mean the follies and worse than follies which bear the name, but the conviction, acted on if not expressed, that a true communion with the divine is given to all that purify themselves with all the force of heart and soul and mind. If there is a man without a touch of this mystic faith, that man is dead while he liveth; for there can be no personal religion, and therefore no true religion, without something of it. Its most definite form is the Christian—he that hath this hope in God purifieth himself as the Man of Nazareth was pure. But it may be quite as real when it is much less definite than this, or not even consciously expressed at all. Those of us who believe in a true light whose ever-present coming into the world lighteth every man, are beyond all others bound to confess that every work which is done on the face of the wide earth for love or duty is as truly communion with God as the Supper of the Lord itself can be, from the Three Hundred in the pass to the child in the slums who gives his last penny to one that needs it more than he does. Here is the secret of the knowledge of God. One common duty done with a true heart will teach more of it than any amount of learning. And it is just the common duties that teach more of it than the great victories. The Man of Nazareth showed His knowledge of men as well as of things divine when He gave us to understand that it is a greater work to give the cup of cold water than to raise the dead. And in these 'greater works' there can be no distinction of race and rank, of age and sex, of learned and simple, and least of all of Christian and pagan. The Church of the first-born which are written in heaven is not limited by election or formal conversion, or even by the Christian name. Its doors are open to all that seek and follow truth, for, as Hort would say, every thought of the heart which is in any sense unworthy is first of all untrue.

Many years ago it was my fortune to spend a Sunday in the great and ancient city of Lyons. Towards evening we climbed the height of Fourvières. A glorious historic site was at our feet, with memories reaching backward to the Council which smote the Hohenstaufen Empire into ruins, and backward still to the time when the threescore states and five of Gaul came year by year to render thanks to heaven for the blessings of the Roman peace. They told us that we could see the Alps. But I looked vainly into the mists that were gathering over the broad plain beyond the meeting of the rivers. 'Look higher': and there they were. High in the air above, the last rays of sunshine lighted up those glorious domes of rosy snow, full seventy miles away. Like those mountains is the revelation of God in history and in your own life. You will not find it in the mists of selfishness and cherished sin. Lift up your hearts, and you will see it looking down on you. But it is not the setting sun which lights the Church of God, the Church of all that love and follow truth. It is the light of the morning, the light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.[1]

[1] H. M. Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God*, ii. 325.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Character of the Kingdom.

'The kingdom of God is at hand.'—Mk 1^{15}.

Jesus presented the idea of the Kingdom in various aspects and in different forms, but withal there was a remarkable unity running through all His teachings.

1. He represents the Kingdom of God as primarily a *subjective state of the individual.* He laid decided stress on its personal and spiritual aspects. He declared, 'The Kingdom of God is within you'; and again, 'the pure in heart shall see God.' The Kingdom comprises the moral principles and emotions. In so far as it was established in the person of its members, it was invisible and spiritual. The ruling thought in His mind was that the Kingdom was first a present and spiritual realm. He was to rule within the sphere of human impulses, desires, and affections. He was to hold court in the human heart. The internal thoughts and affections were to be the seat of His throne. Personal loyalty was the ground of obedience. He was to rule through an experience born of personal affection. His will was not to be enforced through magistrates and rulers, but through a consciousness of His presence acting in the life of the individual. His subjects were to do right from the love of right. Their acts of justice and mercy were to be illumined with the light of love so that the law of righteousness should become to them the perfect law of liberty. The conscious nearness of the personality of God as a living, working force in human affairs would awaken in His followers a new centre of interest and hope. It would enable them to find rapture of soul in His service. His Kingdom in this sense was one of cheer and gladness.

2. Jesus likewise applied the term Kingdom of God to a *present objective in society* as well as to the interior spiritual reality for the individual. He taught broad, general principles which were applicable to different circumstances and to different ages. They were to find adequate expression in every sphere of human activity. The implication of His teachings is that the individual is to attain perfection in and through the perfection of society. The Kingdom is to begin in the individual mind and heart and then grow until it embraces the universal interests of all mankind. It is primarily a spiritual Kingdom but having physical aspects. The material world is the arena of its conflicts and triumphs. In so far as His ideals and spirit dominate human institutions and interpenetrate the various forms of the associated and complex life of the community they become part of His Kingdom. The Home, the Church, and the State are included in its extent.

3. The Kingdom is to be *realized in this world.* The simple and comprehensive petition, 'Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven,' which Jesus taught, upholds the lofty ideals of the Kingdom to be realized in this world. Its whole import shows that it is thoroughly human. In His opening address He says, 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.' He speaks of it as coming nigh unto His hearers who did not conceive of it as an abstract ideal but rather as a living reality. They were to consider it a present fact and a present opportunity confronting every man. It was to be this world illumined and morally crowned. At His coming the Kingdom began to be realized. He did not confine His teaching to represent the Kingdom as something beyond the clouds that was to be postponed to the future world, but it was to be realized in fact. It was a Kingdom of right relations among men established here and now but progressively realized.

4. Jesus also presents the Kingdom under the *aspect of a future event.* Many of His statements corresponded with the popular conception of the day that the Kingdom was to be inaugurated by a future crisis. The apocalyptic aspect of the Kingdom is taught in a series of parables recorded in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew. These parables indicate that they are to have their climax in the final results. The fact that Jesus represents the Kingdom of God as a future apocalyptic event does not conflict with His previous social teaching. It is both a present and a future event. The Kingdom begins in the individual heart and then manifests itself as a vital force in upbuilding the Kingdom in the earth, and finally reaches its culmination in the future and eternal Kingdom. The earth is to be the place of the perfected Kingdom, but not the whole of it. The millennium will come by the increased dominance of Christ's quiet and persistent influence until the whole human family is under His control. The Kingdom, like the grain of mustard seed, begins imperceptibly and through its unobtrusive and continuous influence in society, grows until it becomes a conquering power

in the world and finally reaches a state of heavenly perfection.[1]

Ninth Sunday after Trinity.

The Revolutionary Christ.

'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time . . . but I say unto you.'—Mt 5^{21}.

There are three ways in which Christ made a revolution in the thought and life of His contemporaries.

1. In their ideas about right and wrong. And in two ways.

(1) He relaxed none of the old prohibitions of the Ten Commandments, He 'fulfilled' them; that is, He developed them and added to them in more ways than one. For example, the old law took the form, 'Thou shalt not.' He added, 'Thou shalt.' Now, have we quite realized what a very great step this was in the moral and religious education of the world? 'Thou shalt not'—'Don't do this,' 'Don't do that,' is the law of the nursery, as every one remembers. It is always reminding the child of its naughtiness. It marks a great advance for any one when his eyes are opened to see that a far higher rule of life consists in 'Thou shalts.' This reminds every child of its capacity for goodness. That is the appeal which brings out all that is best in every one. See what it is doing to-day for Boy Scouts and Girl Guides. It is one of the open secrets of a public school. It is the 'Thou shalt,' for the good of the house and the school, that makes a man out of a child. Think what the adoption of 'Thou shalt' as the motto of life, in place of the old repressive 'Thou shalt not,' has done for girls and women during the war. 'Thou shalt,' with an appeal to principle, is the education of individuality, of independent thought. It is spiritual emancipation. It gives free play for the Divine in manhood and womanhood to express itself. It puts religion far above the plane of fear, and lifts it to the plane of love. It marks an immense advance.

(2) But Christ developed the old standard of morality in another direction. In addition to forbidding the wrong act He forbade the wrong thought. It was not the crime, which the law can deal with, that came first with Him, but the sin, the wrongness in thought, that came first. That development revolutionized our standard of judging ourselves. It demands holiness instead of respectability. And respectability is a very different thing from holiness. Again, I do not say that we have learnt the lesson; but we know that we must learn it if we live in the spirit of Christ. This difference also points to a more spiritual thought of God, a loftier theology introduced by Christ.

2. Another revolution which Christ made was in the idea of worship of God. This is less familiar, because few of us have enough detailed knowledge of what the authorized national worship of God was like in Christ's day, even among the Jews, to realize what a revolution it was that Christ wrought. We get in the Gospels a few glimpses of Jewish worship: we read a few allusions to sacrifices going on in the Temple—killing animals as a mode of approaching God; a few allusions to rules about the Sabbath, rubbing ears of corn in one's hands being unlawful, for example; about clean and unclean foods; about washing hands and cups and similar trifles as religious duties.

But most of us do not know enough of all this to realize that this was the authorized conception of the service due to God; that the professional teachers had relegated to a secondary place the grand words of the old prophets; and that they had reverted to childish and almost heathen conceptions of God. It is a ceaseless danger. Routine and externals are so easy a religion; spiritual effort is so hard.

Now, put side by side with this our Lord's teaching. He does not undervalue the discipline of careful and reverent obedience. 'These things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone'; and 'the other' were the weightier matters of the law, judgment and mercy and faith and the love of God. What must we infer from this startling contrast? Must it not be that Christ had a wholly different thought of God from theirs? Was it not because of this difference that He taught that the service of God must be different from theirs? That is the only possible conclusion.

3. There is a third difference in Christ's teaching, the difference in attitude towards our fellowmen. Christ declared that respect, mutual service, brotherhood, love, ought to take the place of indifference and competition and strife for mastery. When He said, 'So it shall not be among you,' He announced a new social, industrial, political,

[1] J. M. Barker, *The Social Gospel and the New Era*, 6.

international, practical principle of infinite importance, of which the world is only beginning now to see the possibilities. This also plainly shows Christ's thought of God as a life and Spirit, inspiring every human soul, and therefore demanding for every human soul our respect and reverence and love. We shall never wish to recur to the old elementary morality, the old sacrificial worship, the old hostile relations of men and nations to one another. As little ought we to wish to cling to the old thought of God from which they sprang.[1]

[1] J. M. Wilson, *Christ's Thought of God.*

The Use of Sign and Symbol in Worship.[1]

By the Reverend H. J. Wotherspoon, D.D., Edinburgh.

In the life of the Spirit, worship is an important element; and in worship symbolism is probably more or less necessary, and is presumably in some measure serviceable. In that aspect—of edification and of assistance to devotion, and not in the æsthetic or antiquarian—I propose to consider the subject assigned to me. Worship is communion with God. Public worship is also communion of man with man, involving, therefore, the psychology of the group. Is it, as such, helped by the use of sign and symbol? Can we by such use reach better expression towards God, or realize better a common consciousness in Divine things? Can we thereby find a greater joy, or obtain a closer fellowship with one another? That is, I take it, our question, and when it is put in that broad way, the answer would, I think, with all due precaution and qualification, be necessarily in the affirmative, and the question would remain a question rather of degree.

Certain distinctions might be necessary:—we must not confuse symbolism with ritual, or with ceremony, or with ornament. Ritual has to do with *rite*—and a rite is an act of Divine service (such as, *e.g.*, marriage or confirmation), and it may include the use of symbol, or it may not. Ceremony, again, relates entirely to the manner of doing things, which must be done somehow, and may be better done in a manner agreed. Ornament, on the other hand, is an attempt at beauty, generally unsuccessful. Ornament may of course be symbolic—for example, we may, very inappropriately, paint the cross on floor tiles, to be trodden under foot: but the symbolism has nothing to do with beauty, and decoration has no necessary connexion with symbolism.

[1] An address delivered at Aberdeen, September 19, 1919.

The criterion of symbolism is significance, and its significance is its whole value, which is more likely to lose by elaboration than to gain. Two bits of stick are tied together and set on a grave mound in France—there you have the symbol complete, and it means more thus than the marble which the Director of Graves may by and by substitute for it. *Sunt lacrimae rerum, et mentem mortalia tangunt.*

One should distinguish, too, between the symbol and the sign. The rude cross on the soldier's grave is a symbol—the dinted helmet which lies on the mound below it is not a symbol, but a sign. Both of them 'touch the mind,' but in different ways. The symbol is metaphorical—the sign is factual; the symbol implies something abstract—the sign reminds of something that has happened or that is true. In marriage, for example, the ring is a symbol—of perpetuity and fidelity: the grasping of hands is a sign, *de presenti*, of the covenant then made. The cross is a symbol of sacrifice, the crucifix is not a symbol, but a sign—it reminds of the actuality of the Atonement, that Christ bore our sins actually thus on the gibbet. A symbol signifies—a sign shows. A sacrament does both.

As for the legitimacy of symbol: its philosophic background is in the nature of things and in our constitution. '*The invisible things of God*,' says the Apostle, '*are from the creation of the world clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made.*' Everywhere the material is expressive of the spiritual. The Divine thought repeats itself in more speeches than one, and on more planes than one; so the spiritual is echoed and repeated in the physical. '*Things made*,' are expressive of truths. Nature is one vast symbolism — the Universe is sacramental — it is the

outward sign of the inward and heavenly. The concrete and the abstract correspond and answer to one another. Light and truth, darkness and evil, these have more than analogy — they connote each other, something identical expresses itself in each of their languages. God, the God of truth, has said, '*Let there be light.*' We who are in God's likeness understand both forms of speech: the voice of creation and the voice of the Spirit, who bears witness with our spirit—both are intelligible to us, and both carry to us the same messages. In the speech which addresses itself to our senses, we recognize light as the same term which in the world of thought we know as truth or in the world of emotion as joy, while darkness is the material expression of ignorance, evil, sorrow. Again, the right line in some way describes the right action: the crooked line depicts the ways of crooked men. These correspondences are not fanciful—they are real: and on them depends our power of ordered thought and of communicated thought. All language is primarily symbolic—its terms are originally physical terms. *Rectus* means 'strong' before it comes to mean 'righteous.' We discover community of experience first in physical relations, and from that we obtain a nomenclature for community of experience in the abstract and subjective. And this primary characteristic of the vehicle of thought does not, at later points, lose its efficiency: we constantly return upon it to verify and to simplify our abstractions—as, for example, in our more recent metaphysic with its uncouth vocabulary of 'this-ness' and 'that-ness,' 'thus-ness' and 'otherwise-ness,' 'here-ness' and 'there-ness.' All poetry and all genuine art (*i.e.* all suggestive art) are made possible only by this sacramental-ness of nature. Take from us the simile and the metaphor and the consciousness of the *lacrimae rerum*, the vision of nature as symbolic—poetry and art would be somewhat crippled of apparatus. Consider any of our Lord's parables—what is it but a quotation from nature or from the fact of things? Yet He reasons from it.

Deity indeed would seem to be the supreme symbolist, and we inevitably the imitators, as soon as we too begin to deal with things of God, whether to think of them or to speak. If one goes to Scripture—if one admits any prophetic origin to Old Testament systems of worship, any Divine prescription to the Old Testament methods of communion with God, or any foundation of inspiration to prophecy itself — then one finds oneself involved in the sanction of symbolism as the natural vehicle of worship, and in the conception of worship as a body of symbolisms. Set all that aside, if you feel free to do so, as obsolete and of another dispensation (though the Divine nature and human nature and the nature of things persist as they were)—come into the new age of realities in the Spirit: and you find that the central rites of the new life, the spiritual life, are symbols and much more—symbol and reality blent into sacrament; and in the sacrament (if our 'Confession' stands for true witness) you find the living Christ, and the flowing Spirit of God. So far as rite or worship are prescribed by our Lord, they are sacramental: and whatever else sacrament may be, it is first and on the face of it, *symbol.*

There is perhaps something besides in such suggestion as the Apocalypse supplies in its descriptions of the worship of Heaven. The worship there described is symbolic in setting and acts: the altar, the Lamb, the white garments, the crowns, the palms, the harps, the incense, the gestures are symbols: without them there would not remain much except the Tersanctus, the Ascriptions, and the responsive Amens. Of course the whole vision is symbolic, and therefore perhaps there is the less to be learnt from its details, so far as these illustrate our subject. Yet there is this, that one would hardly expect to find the harmful or the forbidden or the useless employed to describe for us what it is intended to represent as the pattern in the heavens. So far as a general review of Scripture may take us, the symbolic and the significant do not, in fact, seem to be proscribed. One might almost be carried so far as to suppose that their use was encouraged, or at least was regarded as natural—perhaps as in some degree requisite for the expression of things otherwise unutterable. For, as the sacraments imply, there is after all an irreducible minimum of symbolism; at least, if even that minimum is to be avoided, we must adopt the methods of Quakerism, and abandon what most Christians hold for normal and fundamental to Christian worship. And there are symbols of universal sanction, such as the uplifted hand of benediction, which comparatively few of us disuse. The question after all is one of degree.

And so I think it ought to be. No one can

very well contend that any frequent or extensive use of symbolism is *necessary* to worship. Mohammedanism demonstrates the contrary; for Mohammedanism excludes the use of symbol (except in gesture), and yet has a vivid and universally observed worship. On the other hand, it must be remembered that Mohammedanism has extremely little to symbolize. Its creed is a brief negative, '*there is no God but God*'—with as brief a citation of testimony, '*And Mohammed is His prophet.*' One cannot symbolize a negative, or a man. Mohammedanism is the religion of the *moyen homme sensuel*, be he Scot or Arab:—a belief that there is a God, and fate (or luck), and heaven for all but exceptional rascals, once they are dead. It is the common creed of the ordinary man—and it needs no symbol, for it has no mystery, nothing higher than the average sensual life which suggests it. Occasion for symbol arises in proportion to the richness of faith, the complexity of religious experience, and the apprehension of the mystery of God.

The power of the symbol, I repeat, lies in its significance. It can suggest so much, and so instantly, and to all simultaneously: and that without elaboration or the chilling pause which any attempt to say in words the same thing must impose. Take the commonest of symbols, one which I have already instanced — the uplifted hand of blessing; see how it moves a multitude, imposes a mood, bends all in one emotion as the wind sweeps the cornfield. Consider how much it summarizes—of God the Father, of the mission of Christ which in the act re-emerges from the heavens, of the communion of the Holy Ghost, of the forgiveness of sins, of the fellowship of the flock, of the presence of the supernatural in the Church. All that is implied, and those who are submitted to it feel together in thus meeting the thought of God, the faith of Christ, the pulse of the Spirit's life. Or, again, how long will it take to say what is said by those two bits of stick on the soldier's grave? how else could you say it to every passer-by? how else touch every heart to the message? There you have the power of the symbol to unite, to embrace in one atmosphere the whole group with which you desire to deal. The symbol creates its own atmosphere. It is able to suggest—it appeals to imagination and association. It brings together the distant in time and space—what it means to us it has meant to so many of all the ages—what it means to us it means to men of our faith the world over. And it has the power of allusion: on the moment it brings before the mind a world of recollection, and places the soul in contact with its beliefs and hopes. It finds the shortest way to the heart. I think again of the cross on the soldier's grave and its infinite implication — of sacrifice, redemption, peace, promise, of the 'body still united to Christ,'—could any inscription say as much? or say it and be felt, as all men understand this? Obviously the symbol has certain values of expression and appeal which words attain with difficulty. It is significant, and conveys its significance without the cumber of mental effort or the challenge to thought, which the intellectual statement provokes. Hence its restfulness, itself a great value.

Whether these values can safely and profitably be appropriated to the service of worship is an open and fair question. Something certainly may be lost by disuse of the symbolic and significant: we may fall into dulness—we may lose ourselves in a dry intellectualism: worship may perish in dialectic—it may find itself left with only one side of human nature to which to appeal, and with only one method of addressing even that. Instead of worship, we may end in discussion; instead of communion we may have criticism. In the sum of it, we may reach a certain staleness; we may become wearisome to one another; we may find ourselves alone with the few who are capable of interest in discussion, or are equal to the sustained effort of intellectual appreciations. It is again an open and fair question whether we have not already reached this condition.

On the other hand, symbolism in worship has its undoubted dangers. It may be dangerous by excess, or by its fascination, and the pursuit of it for its own sake. It may overlay the understanding. It may drift into complication, multiplication, triviality. It may obsess worship. It may overtax the imagination and memory. It may become spiritually obsolete—for symbolism is always open to this risk, that its origin and sense may be forgotten in habit. The cross itself—it can be used meaninglessly, superfluously, commonly—without recollection: floriated and distorted and powdered about as a decoration for blank spaces: none considering its grimness or its glory.

That, however, is no more than to say that symbols are only for significance, and that, if they

lose significance, they are nothing at all. To conserve them as being anything, they had perhaps need to be few, simple, obvious, and very carefully protected for significant use—if it were practicable, I should wish to say, regulated use. The unauthorized symbol may be as irksome as fancy ritual can be.

A symbol is no symbol unless it is significant; and to be significant, it must be understood. Even the Sacraments need constant exposition—it is a sound canon of our practice that with the ordinance must go the Word—else the Sacraments themselves may become merely conventions (as Baptism, for lack of the Word to go with it, is in danger of becoming). A symbol, therefore, has the less value, unless it is vernacular to the people's thoughts, and unless for its meaning it is acceptable. In order to unite in one mind and impulse, the symbol must mean the same to all and be received of all. The Union Jack is an example of such a symbol. The Red Flag, on the other hand, is intelligible enough, and it may be trusted to move any assemblage—but it will not unite: there are those whom it is pretty certain to provoke.

This consideration is, I think, of importance when the question is one of symbolism in worship. The purpose is to edify—what cannot be done to edification had better not be done at all. Things may be lawful which are not expedient.

One may discuss such matters *in vacuo*, as I have been doing, considering symbolism simply on its merits and as it is in the nature of things. And if one does so, symbolism may certainly appear to have philosophic basis and scriptural sanction; one may recognize that it answers to a human instinct, even to a human need. One may think it to be a congruous aid to worship, holding as it does in presence of the mind beliefs which should never be absent from consciousness, yet do not admit of constant verbal repetition. One may see that it supplies a language for worship in which those may agree, whom dialectic statements would set in antagonism. One may even think that symbolism has this peculiar power because of a certain intrinsic spirituality, which gives it a universal appeal. And for such reasons one may wish that its use were native to our habit of mind, and that it could be freely and happily utilized in our spiritual life. I am doubtful, however, how far under present conditions any such free and happy use is possible. All things must be with a view to edification—and edification cannot be compulsory. There can be little process of edification within an atmosphere of nervousness, suspicion, or antagonism. I am therefore no advocate of the use of symbol or sign in worship beyond the understanding and the sympathies of our people. There are, however, canons of common sense which they will always appreciate. That which has to be done in some way, let it be done in a way which is significant of truth. That which has to exist in some form, let its form be expressive rather than meaningless. These simple rules cover a good deal, and most men will approve them. For the rest, if one desires a symbol, let him see that it is understood; but also, let him see that what it expresses is already in the people's heart. Our first task is to *teach the faith*. Where the faith is held in power and fulness, it will seek expression in all forms that offer themselves.

There are, however, certain primary and inevitable symbolisms to which either with a positive or else with a negative implication we cannot avoid being committed: those, namely, of *place*, *speech*, and *gesture*. For if we meet, we must meet somewhere; and being met, we must either speak or be silent; and some gesture of body we must assume. And these things are significant.

As to the first of them, our places of religion, there is comparatively little difficulty. Edifices expressive of worship are welcomed, often demanded. Now the edifice is itself the chief vessel of worship and in a sense its primary symbol. It means much that from the people themselves there comes the requirement that it should speak less exclusively of man and his need of instruction, more of God and of His glory and praise.

We less readily apprehend or appreciate the symbolism of united speech. Our people are without active vocal part in profession or in prayer. They are slow to assume it, and the ministry is slow to invite them to it. Yet what else gives expression to the priesthood of believers, or permits the sense of fellowship in faith and worship? Where responsive worship is heartily practised, it has certainly remarkable emotional value.

The most important, however, of all symbolisms, the simplest and the fundamental, is, I think, that of the personal gesture of the worshipper. That counts for more in the truth of the spirit than any apparatus of furnishing, and more than any action

which is not the man's own, but is the gesture or act of the officiant on his behalf? Apart from the divinely instituted Sacraments, as to which there is no question, this is the only department of symbolism which seems to me to be of immediate and inevitable importance. Because it is a symbolism in which we have no choice but every one of us to engage—we must worship in some attitude, and all attitudes are expressive; but much more, because attitude of body has intimate reflex influence on the attitude of mind and soul. As to this influence of body upon mind in our organism, modern psychology is clear. A threatening gesture awakes in us a threatening mood; a submissive gesture evokes a submissive mood. As the soldiers' song taught us (and it was scientifically accurate), the way to feel cheerful is to 'smile, smile, smile.' It helps then to reverence, if we place ourselves in a posture of reverence; it helps us to pray, if we assume an attitude of prayer. A grave mistake was (I humbly think) made, when about the sixties of last century we left our ancient and indeed primitive custom of standing in public prayer—religion lost more by that than it has gained or could gain by the acquisition of organs or insertion of painted windows. These are really 'externals' to worship, and to the worshippers; gesture of body, on the other hand, is no more external to him than gesture of soul—one's body is not external to oneself; gesture is of the man, and it affects him in the spirit. From the point of view of the spiritual life, nothing else within this range of consideration seems of comparable importance. Everything that is pretty, and even some things that are edifying, might profitably be sacrificed, if thereby it were possible to recover that which is reverent. It is by example rather than by precept that the recapture may be effected.

Contributions and Comments.

'No one shall snatch them out of my hand.'

It does not seem to have been recognized (there is, *e.g.*, no reference in R.V. or W.H.) that Jesus was quoting or echoing an O.T. prophecy when He said, 'They shall never perish, and *no one shall snatch* (ἁρπάζει) *them out of my hand.* My Father, which hath given them unto me, is greater than all; and *no one is able to snatch* (ἁρπάζειν) *out of my Father's hand.* I and my Father are one' (Jn 10^{28-30}).

It seems clear, however, that our Lord must have been referring definitely to Is 43^{13}. 'Yea, from everlasting I am He, and *there is none that can deliver* (*lit. snatch*) *out of my hand*' (ואין מידו מציל). הציל, which is one of the many words for '*deliver*' in Hebrew, has the particular significance of '*pull away*' or '*snatch.*'

The quotation appears to have been made directly from the Hebrew, rather than through the LXX, which is somewhat colourless (*καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν μου ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος*).

The recognition that our Lord had this Scripture in mind throws some light on that hard saying in Jn 17^{12} . . . 'that they may be one even as we are. While I was with them I kept them in thy name, which thou hast given me, and I guarded them, and not one of them perished, but the son of perdition, *that the Scripture might be fulfilled.*'

It has generally been taken for granted that the words 'that the Scripture might be fulfilled' were concerned with the 'perishing' of the 'son of perdition.' The R.V., *e.g.*, refers to Ps 109^{8}: 'Let his days be few and let another take his office.' Westcott prefers to take Ps 41^{9} as the Scripture in question: 'Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me.' Now these two passages are quite apposite, even though perhaps superficially so, in Ac 1^{20} and Jn 13^{18}, where they are respectively cited. But neither of them is sufficiently relevant to the only point here raised, namely, the 'perishing' of the 'son of perdition,' to justify the advertisement of them as Scriptures that had been fullfiled. To drag them in is, in fact, far-fetched.

It seems much more probable that the words 'but the son of perdition' are parenthetic, and that the fulfilment of Scripture spoken of has no connexion with them at all, but with the main thoughts in the verse 'I kept them . . . I guarded them, and not one of them perished.'

We are here evidently in exactly the same circle of ideas as in Jn 10^{28-30}, as may be seen by the following comparisons:

'My Father which hath given them to me' (10^{29}).
'them . . . which thou hast given me' (17^{12}).

'I and the Father are one' (10^{30}).
'that they may be one even as we are' (17^{12}).

'they shall never perish' (10^{28}).
'not one of them perished' (17^{12}).

Lastly, as we have seen, we have in 10^{28}, 'no one shall snatch them out of my hand,' and in 10^{29} 'no one is able to snatch them out of my Father's hand,' quotations, hardly modified at all, of the Scripture Is 43^{13}, 'and there is no one who shall snatch out of my hand.' And these quotations have their counterpart in 17^{12} in the words 'that the Scripture might be fulfilled.'

It is reasonable therefore to suppose that it was the same Scripture in both cases which our Lord had in mind. In both passages, in somewhat different ways, He claims to be the fulfilment of this prophetic saying which at the first was spoken in reference to God the Father, but which was likewise true of Himself, for He had shown Himself and would further show Himself to be, in fact, 'one with the Father.'

If these conclusions are correct, Jn 17^{12} when expanded would read as follows: 'While I was with them I kept them in thy name which thou hast given me, and I guarded them, *and* [*except the son of perdition*] *no one of them perished, thus fulfilling the Scripture which says, "There is no one who shall pluck out of my hand."*'

ROBERT A. AYTOUN.

Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

Luke xv. 30.

THE question of the origin of the Vulgate reading in Lk 15^{30}, 'devoravit substantiam suam,' to which Mr. Senior drew attention in the March number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, deserves investigation and discussion.

It is not my intention to do this here, but it may be useful to point out that this is the reading of the MS. Add. 14453 (cent. v. or vi.) of the Peshiṭta Syriac Gospels, which is MS. 14 in Gwilliam's *apparatus criticus* to his Tetraevangelium Sanctum, where the reading is ܒܙܘܗܝ, 'divitias suas,' instead of the usual Peshiṭta ܢܟܣܝ, 'possessionem tuam.' Gwilliam in his note refers to Payne Smith, Thes. Syr. col. 2375, where the distinction between ܒܙܘܐ and ܢܟܣܐ is adverted to; then in a quotation from lex. B.A. the sentence occurs, 'according to what was said about that prodigal son who dissipated his riches' (ܕܐܡܪ ܒܙܘܗܝ). It may also be pointed out that Aphraates, Dem. 7, 12, De Paenitentibus, referring to the Prodigal Son, says, 'look at the son who dissipated his riches' (ܒܙܘܗܝ ܕܐܡܪ); and a few lines below he says, that his father did not rebuke him 'on account of his riches which he dissipated' (ܥܠ ܒܙܘܗܝ ܕܐܡܪ). Again in 7^{23}, Aphraates says, 'Remember beloved, the son who dissipated his riches' (ܒܙܘܗܝ ܕܐܡܪ). It is clear that Aphraates was acquainted with the passage in the form represented to-day by Gwilliam's MS. 14.

The reading 'his living' is also that of the Coptic, as represented in George Horner's excellent edition. His MS. H, however, as he notes in his *apparatus criticus*, has 'thy living.'

Further, in any discussion of the Vulgate reading, attention should be given to the reading of D which has πάντα in the place of σου τὸν βίον. See Chase, *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels*, p. 46.

ALBERT BONUS.

Alphington.

Entre Nous.

SOME TOPICS.

The First Principle of Religion.

'WHEREAS Robertson Smith held that religion, reduced to its very lowest terms, must imply at least belief in a god and communion with him, Frazer considers religion to be the belief that the course of nature and of human life is controlled by personal beings superior to man. By the one view stress is laid on the mystic side of religion, on the communion which is effected through sacrifice; by

the other view stress is laid on the power which the gods may be induced by prayer and supplication to exercise for the benefit of man. Our first reflexion, therefore, is that any view of religion, to be comprehensive, cannot confine itself to either of these aspects singly, but must find room for both—for both prayer and sacrifice. They cannot be mutually exclusive, nor can they be simply juxtaposed, as though they were atoms unrelated to one another, accidental neighbours in the same district. There must be a higher unity, not created by or subsequent to the coalescence of elements originally independent of each other, but a higher unity of which both prayer and sacrifice are manifestations. Higher unity, I venture to suggest, is the first principle of religion; and, if it is not explicitly recognized as the first principle of religion either by Robertson Smith or by Frazer, that may well be because their attention is concentrated on the earlier stages in the evolution of religion, when as yet it is not conspicuous and is, therefore, though in fact operative, liable to be overlooked. As Ferrier has said, "first principles of every kind have their influence, and indeed operate largely and powerfully long before they come to the surface of human thought and are articulately expounded." What, then, is the first principle of religion which only after long ages of evolution rose to the surface of human thought, and which, though it had been operative largely and powerfully, came only in the slow course of human evolution to be articulately expounded? The first principle of religion is love—love of one's neighbour and one's God.'

That is a statement to be treasured. For it is due, not to a theologian, but to a great authority in the Science of Comparative Religion. Mr. F. S. Marvin has edited a volume of essays on *Recent Developments in European Thought* (Milford; 12s. 6d. net). He himself writes the introductory survey and sees clear signs of progress. 'Read any account of an English community in the early nineteenth century, say George Eliot's "Milby" in the *Scenes of Clerical Life*. How far more humane, more enlightened, and happier is the state of the succeeding community, the Nuneaton or Coventry of the present day!' Then Professor A. E. Taylor tells what has been done since the Franco-Prussian War in Philosophy. The quotation we have made is from the third essay: its title is The Evolution of Religion, its author Dr. F. B. Jevons.

The book is of far finer stuff than the volumes of collected papers, so numerous of late, have usually been. Every author can write, and every author can write with authority. Professor Herford writes on Poetry, Mr. G. P. Gooch on History, Mr. A. D. Lindsay on Political Theory, Mr. C. R. Fay on Economic Development, Professor W. H. Bragg on Atomic Theories, Professor Leonard Doncaster on Biology, Mr. A. Clutton-Brock on Art, Dr. Ernest Walker on Music, and Miss F. Melian Stawell on the Modern Renascence.

SOME TEXTS.

Mt 26[45].

'Sleep on now and take your rest.' The word translated 'now' is λοιπόν (in Mk 14[41] τὸ λοιπόν, but the article is omitted by the editors), which means 'what is left,' 'the remainder.' Our 'now' is from the Vulgate *iam*. Some time ago the meaning was discussed in *Hermathena*, and such translations were suggested as 'the future is for sleep,' or 'sleep out the rest of your sleep.' In the new number of the same annual Dr. W. J. M. Starkie suggests a way out of the difficulty. In modern Greek λοιπόν (with or without the article) means 'but,' 'however,' and with an imperative it may be translated 'well, then, if you will.' So we have 'Sleep on then, if you will, and take your rest.'

Mt 28[2-4].

In the same annual Dr. Starkie discusses the 'earthquake' of Mt 28[2]—'And behold, there was a great earthquake.' No earthquake is mentioned by Mark or Luke. Dr. Starkie believes that the earthquake in Matthew is due to a mistranslation. In v.[4] we read, 'and for fear of him the watchers did quake' (R.V.). As verb and noun are one, Dr. Starkie believes that we should translate v.[2] simply, 'And there was a great quaking.' The Persian version actually has, 'and there was there great consternation and fear.'

NEW POETRY.

Lady Margaret Sackville.

Mr. Wilfrid Scawen Blunt contributes a preface to *Selected Poems*, by Lady Margaret Sackville (Constable; 6s. net). He says: 'Lady Margaret Sackville is the best in my opinion of our English poetesses, at least of the younger generation. Certainly she is among the most interesting.' He

is pleased that she has returned out of the blind alley of blank verse, 'the common snare of young and ambitious writers of a dozen years ago, and that she has emerged into the daylight of sound rhyme, metre and melody, the three essentials in our English tradition'; for blank verse, he says, 'though it may be poetry, is not really verse at all, even in master hands, say, rather a dignified kind of prose pompous in recitation and for common reading, dull.'

The volume is in three parts—Poems, Dramatic Poems, and Poems 1914–1917. The last are war poems wholly. One of them is that fine poem 'Reconciliation,' quoted already in this magazine. Now let us take one out of the earliest of all, and let it be

THE GHOST.

'Oh! who is this that calls through the grey rain to me?'—
'Oh! it's I you loved, and loved too well, and I've been drowned at sea.'
'But if it's you I loved so well, and if it's you I lost,
You who came not as a living man, why come you now as a ghost?'

'Oh! proud and foolish was my heart, but now my pride is done,
I'm but a weary waif, driven through the lone seas, alone.'—
'Oh! many's the time, day out, day in, I called in vain to you,
Now you may knock at my closed door: I shall not let you through.'

'Is there no shelter then for me?' 'Fast bolted is the door.'
'And is your heart all dead to me?' 'Dead as was yours before.
Comfort you as best you may, drift seaward with the rain—
The heart which died for a living man, wakes not for the dead again!'

Alec de Candole.

A few months ago a volume of essays was published entitled 'The Faith of a Subaltern.' It was written by a lad who fell in battle at the age of twenty-one. It might have been written by a rained and experienced theologian. Now at volume of poems by the same lad has been published. It is entitled *Poems*, by Alec de Candole (Cambridge: at the University Press; 4s. 6d. net). And taking the two volumes together we have no hesitation in saying that Alec de Candole is the greatest literary phenomenon of the War—greater than Rupert Brooke or any other. We have already reviewed the volume of essays. Of the poetry it will be sufficient to quote the following sonnet, though almost any poem could be quoted as acceptably:

SALISBURY CATHEDRAL.

I prayed here when I faced the future first
Of war and death, that GOD would grant me power
To serve Him truly, and through best and worst
He would protect and guide me every hour.
And He has heard my prayer, and led me still
Through purging war's grim wondrous revelation
Of fear and courage, death and life, until
I kneel again in solemn adoration
Before Him here, and still black clouds before
Threat as did those which now passed through are bright;
Therefore, with hope and prayer and praise once more
I worship Him, and ask that with His might
He still would lead, and I with utter faith
Follow, through life or sharpest pain or death.

Henry W. Clark.

The Rev. Henry W. Clark, D.D., is a theologian and a poet. The union has been accomplished before, but rarely. Let this single poem from *The Watch-Tower* (Chapham & Hall; 3s. 6d. net) prove his possession of the poetic gift. Its title is

THE LOSER'S PRIZE.

Flutter of flags as the victor flies
Over the line—then a rattling fusillade,
Cheer out of cheer, as he takes his prize!
Fame at its noon for him — while, hope thwarted,
I, who so brave at the forward-signal started,
Stand shamed in the shade.

Shamed! Not a whit! For I reached *my* goal
Half the race through, when, at challenge of despair,

Swift my heart sprang, courage hot and whole,
At the flung gage, and her vow renewing,
Scorning fate's scornfulness, faint and yet pursuing,
Smote fear to its lair.

In from the deep swung God's tide of praise,
Surge and re-surge, o'er the strand of silence spread,
Stony and cold, by the crowd at gaze;
Close in my soul I embraced my guerdon—
Manhood proved strong for the lifting of its burden—
So shame, shame-flushed, fled!

E. J. B. Kirtlan.

Dr. Ernest J. B. Kirtlan, B.A., B.D., has made an English and modern version of the 'Crucifixion' in the Towneley Mystery Plays. *A Little Drama of the Crucifixion* is his title (Epworth Press; 1s. 3d. net). In a short introduction he tells the story of the Plays. No quotation from the Play is possible, but the sequence which was sung on Easter morning before the Gospel of the Resurrection will give an idea both of the original Latin and of his version:

APOSTLES:
Dic Nobis Maria:
Quid vidisti in via?

MARIA:
Sepulchrum Christi viventis,
Et gloriam vidi resurgentis:
Angelicos testes
Sudarium et vestes.
Surrexit Christus, spes mea:
Praecedet vos
In Galileam.

APOSTLES:
Scimus Christum surrexisse
A mortuis vere:
In nobis victor
Rex miserere!

Anglicized it would be:

APOSTLES:
What sawest thou, Mary, say,
As thou wentest on thy way?

MARY:
I saw the tomb wherein
The living Christ had lain.
I saw His glory
As He rose again:
Napkins and linen clothes
And angels twain.
Yea, Christ is risen,
My hope: and He
Will go before
To Galilee.

APOSTLES:
We know that Christ
Has risen from the grave:
Hail, King of Victory!
Have mercy, Lord, and save.

Edmond Holmes.

Mr. T. J. Cobden-Sanderson has selected and arranged *Sonnets and Poems* by Edmond Holmes (Cobden-Sanderson; 6s. net), and has published them with this Introduction: 'Adoration has been from earliest days—the farthest in retrospect—a function of humanity, but the object has changed with the years. In Religion it has been God—in how many shapes! In Art, Beauty: in Science—its uses! To-day the object is split up into things innumerable. Who shall gather the separated rays into one glory infinite? Who or what? The transformed Science of the Universe—transformed into Vision, the Ecstasies of Cosmic Love, adorative and sympathetically creative? is that the coming æons' Divinity?

'The Sonnets and Poems gathered together into this Anthology would seem to attempt an answer to this insurgent question, and with this tentative indication of their purpose and meaning they may be left to make their own appeal, direct to the reader.'

The reader probably knows already what he will find, for Edmond Holmes the poet can scarcely have escaped his notice. If he does not, a surprise is his, and in either case an exquisite pleasure. The difficulty of the reviewer is to make *his* selection. The sonnets are as the poems and the poems as the sonnets, and there is not a weak line in the one or the other; there is scarcely an inadequate image, there is certainly not an unworthy thought.

The Epilogue is the poets' creed. Take the end of it:

The sun is high in the heaven: the flush has faded away:
But my heart is aflame for ever with the dawn of a larger day.
Let the years bring joy or sorrow: let Fate send glory or gloom:
I fear no shadow of darkness: I fear no presage of doom.
I have guessed the secret of being: I have probed the meaning of death:
I know why we wake from slumber: I know why we draw life's breath.
I have read the riddle of evil,—the riddle of passion and pain:
I know that no heart has striven or sighed or suffered in vain.
I am clasped to the breast of Nature: I glide where her waters glide:
And I feel, as each ripple rocks me, the swing of the world's one tide.
. . . . . .
The sun has climbed to the zenith, but his light has died from the skies:
There is fear at the heart of Nature, and a mist of tears in her eyes:
Dark as despair the storm-clouds in sad procession move:—
But my heart is aflame for ever with the dawn of the light of love.

Vera M. Brittain.

From the poets represented in *Oxford Poetry, 1919* (Blackwell; 1s. 6d. net), we choose Vera M. Brittain. Her poem, 'To a V.C.,' is thoughtful and expressive. The volume on the whole is scarcely up to the high mark of previous volumes. Has the end of the war brought the end of inspiration? It is rather that the pause has come between the fierce agony and the new life. With the quiet of the time at hand and the memory of the time that is past we shall reach higher things:

Because your feet were stayed upon that road
Whereon the others swiftly came and passed,
Because the harvest you and they had sowed
You only reaped at last.

'Tis not your valour's meed alone you bear
Who stand the object of a nation's pride,
For on that humble Cross you live to wear
Your friends were crucified.
They shared with you the conquest over fear,
Sublime self-disregard, decision's power,
But Death, relentless, left you lonely here
In recognition's hour.

Their sign is yours to carry to the end;
The lost reward of gallant hearts as true
As yours they called their leader and their friend
Is worn for them by you.

Ruth Pitter.

First Poems (Cecil Palmer; 2s. 6d. net) should be tenderly handled. But these poems by Ruth Pitter are not the first poems of ordinary poets. It would not be true to say that there are no immaturities, but whether of form or idea they are quite surprisingly few. The clearest sign of youth is the frequent appearance of the fairy or the fay. But what do you say to this?

THE CONSUMMATION.

Looks royal, songs for heaven meet,
Thou wishest, thinking on his worth
Whose faintest image is more sweet
Than all thy dearest loves on earth.

The royal look is marred with years,
The song celestial is made
Into a litany of tears,
Into a blossom of the shade.

Thou art fordone: thine heart is rent
To praise who hath no fear nor shame,
Yet when thine utmost life is spent
Thou hast not even said his name:

But peace, the triumph is not ripe.
Canst thou not sleep a little space,
Or dream upon the oaten pipe
Till there appear the wishèd face?

Then well sufficing shall arise
From thy quiet heart that was so wrung,
A look in those translated eyes,
A word in that diviner tongue.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Professor H. R. Mackintosh is best known by his volume on *The Person of Christ* in the 'International Theological Library.' But he has published a volume on *The Originality of the Christian Message* (Duckworth; 5s. net) by means of which we believe that not only his skill as a writer but his learning as a theologian will be still more clearly seen. It is a volume of lectures—lectures delivered on the Haskell Foundation, in the Theological Seminary of Oberlin College, Ohio—and Professor Mackintosh is one of the very few learned theologians who can lecture well. Nothing is ever lost of the learning in the lecture, and nothing is ever lost of the lecture in the learning.

His purpose is to prove that Christianity when it appeared in the world was essentially a new religion. Some of us believe that that needs little proving. But Dr. Mackintosh is aware of the literature that has gathered round the Study of Religions. He knows that the originality of Christianity is the most difficult thing in the world to prove now. And he also knows that it is the thing most worth proving.

It is most worth proving. For if Christianity is not essentially original, it is not essentially superior to other religions. And if it is not superior to other religions, what has the missionary to carry with him to peoples professing Buddhism, Muhammadanism, Taoism, or any other of the great religions? What has he to say to the adherent of Judaism? 'It is a matter,' says Dr. Mackintosh, 'of crucial moment for the advocate of foreign missions.' And he quotes Mr. J. H. Oldham, an unrivalled authority on such a subject: 'The nerve of missionary endeavour,' says Mr. Oldham, 'is the conviction that in the Christian revelation there is something distinctive and vital which the world cannot do without.'

But it is very difficult to prove the essential originality of Christianity. 'It was one theme of the second-century Apologists, and well-known discussions of it abounded in the eighteenth century, though the chief disputants showed very little sense for history. But on the modern mind it bears with a quite peculiar sharpness of impact. The scientific Study of Religions, which has recently made giant strides and has proved of such value to theology in its historic and apologetic branches as permanently to widen our view of the religious life of man, prevents us from assuming so naïvely as our grandfathers did that the Christian faith is unique and independent. God has nowhere left Himself without witness.'

'A great missionary once said that he had never preached the Gospel anywhere without finding

that God had been there before him. Not only have there been revelations less adequate than Christianity, but devout souls through these less perfect media were enabled in a real measure to trust God and do His will with an obedient faith to which the Father surely responds. There has been genuine fruition for such worshippers, not aspiration merely; and the Church has scarcely yet appreciated the width of the charter to hope given by St. Peter's great words, "In every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of Him." By degrees we are learning to conceive of Christianity not as an isolated thing—truth in sheer contrast to ethnic lies—but as the climax and crown of other faiths in their nobler meaning.'

'To describe one religion, however, as "the climax and crown" of others is clearly to discriminate most positively among religions everywhere in respect of truth and value; it is to apply a standard of excellence or perfection. Hence we cannot too often remind ourselves that the principles of historical research, relating as they must to purely causal issues, are insufficient for these deeper questions of validity. Our conviction, if we have it, that Christianity is the best religion in the world—better, say, than Judaism or Buddhism—is in no sense the fruit of merely scientific or disinterested thought. It is rather the reaction of our whole nature to the spiritual meaning with which the historian's facts are laden. It is a value-judgment, in short, irreducible to terms that express purely causal relationships. And to perceive that things are what they are and what they come from—in other words, to make a clear distinction between truth and genesis, origin and value—is the first and possibly the last lesson which the student of religious history ought to master.'

But what is Christianity? Clearly that is the first thing to settle, and Professor MACKINTOSH recognizes it. His definition is short. 'For my part, I take the Christian religion to mean, in essence, fellowship with God mediated through Jesus Christ.' It is as sufficient as it is short. That is Christianity, and just that is what no other religion is. The originality of Christianity lies in its power to bring us into communion with God, and it is properly called Christianity because it is Christ that brings us into that communion. Dr. MACKINTOSH'S whole book is an exposition of that definition.

Take a single item. Jesus had to make God known. For until a man knows God he is not likely to desire to have fellowship with Him. He was original in the God He revealed, in the way he revealed Him, in the completeness of the revelation, and in its universality.

First, Jesus Christ was original in the God He made known. It was a God who goes forth in search of the sinful. 'The best that had formerly been proclaimed was that God in mercy would receive all who came back to Him penitently; now, for the first time in the history of religion, it was made known that the Father unweariedly seeks the lost, that He reckons no cost too great if only His children can be reached and won. As men stood in Jesus' presence, as they looked back on all that His coming had meant for them, they realized that the bounds of their conception of God had been enlarged. It was not merely that God willed their salvation: He took the first step; He bowed to the law which makes sacrifice the first charge on love's resources.'

Next, He made this God known, not in His teaching, but in Himself. 'No such person as Jesus had ever lived before, and in His character and experience God was perfectly known at last. Every great man is greater than his language, and psychologists or historians whose foible it is to disparage the originality of humanity's leaders by asking dubiously how much of what they say had been said before, overlook the vital fact that epoch-making progress in the past has invariably come not by words but persons. The new truth

about God became flesh in Jesus; He guaranteed the message by being Himself; mediated by all that He was and did, it seized men with fresh elemental power and passed like fire from heart to heart.'

Thirdly, this revelation was new in its purity, its coherence, its inward spiritual harmony. 'Again grant for the moment that every word of Jesus concerning God had been uttered previously; still, the omissions were new. The Pharisee, it is true, had spoken of God's grace and holiness, but he had unfortunately said other things which made grace and holiness more than doubtful. The Eternal had been occasionally represented as a deity of autocratic and capricious power, who laboured under feelings of revenge. But this means that truth is hopelessly cancelled out by untruth. Error throws it so far into the background that its power over conscience and heart fades. To give a pure thought of God—to convince men that God is light and in Him is no darkness at all—is accordingly to give a new thought. This pure thought of necessity has for its medium a pure life. The authentically Christian view of God, from which the obscuring elements have been cleared away, is distilled through that which we know Jesus to have been.'

Lastly, the God whom Jesus made known is the God of all men. 'National and particularistic limits are abolished once for all. In the Old Testament, the Fatherhood of God is strictly a correlative of the chosen people, and is stretched by way of exception to cover the *gêrim* or resident aliens who had become naturalized in Israel. We must bear in mind that even the author of Psalm xxiii. would have repudiated the suggestion that the words, "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want," could be rightly adopted by a Greek or Persian. Thus within Israel the love of God is clear as the sun, but scarcely God's love for man as man. For that the world must wait for Jesus. In Him every limitation is overthrown. The lost son in the Parable, who is met with kisses and a feast, is no lost Jew simply, no fallen member of the chosen people; he is the lost *man*, the Father's straying child in any time or place. Even Jesus uttered no more piercing word than "There is joy in the presence of the angels over one sinner that repenteth."'

'Yet how few we Friends are.'

Mr. John W. GRAHAM, M.A., Principal of Dalton Hall, University of Manchester, has written a book on *The Faith of a Quaker*, which has been published at the Cambridge University Press (21s. net). It is not a well written book, nor is it well arranged. But we should not be wrong if we accepted it as the official doctrine of the Society of Friends to-day—if anything that belongs to Quakers can be called official. In the end of the book Mr. GRAHAM uses the words, 'Yet how few we Friends are.'

Why are they so few? Mr. GRAHAM gives two reasons—the want of placed ministers and the absence of music in worship. But the sympathetic reader of this book will conclude that there is a reason lying deeper than these.

If he concludes that it is the absence of the sense of sin he will be confirmed by the index. In the index there is one reference to sin. It is to a single short paragraph on a single page. Throughout the book there is no recognition of disagreement with God. That every man is out of harmony with his Maker, through his own conduct—for we need not ask Mr. GRAHAM to entertain the idea of inherited sin—that is not taken account of. It is not denied. It is simply ignored. The whole book—this modern exposition of the creed of the Quaker—is written on the assumption that man is right with God and has nothing to do but recognize it.

Is that Mr. GRAHAM'S own modern idea? It is also for Quakerism ancient, as ancient as it

could be. 'It is remarkable,' says Mr. GRAHAM, speaking of George Fox, 'that confession of sin, pardon, conscious weakness, repentant retracing of error, are wholly absent either in his times of darkness or of light. He says: "When I came to eleven years of age I knew pureness and righteousness, for while I was a child I was taught how to walk to be kept pure." We have here a symmetrical well-formed natural leader, "in unity with the creation," to use a phrase of Fox, and in whom the control from the beginning was where it ought to be. We may be quite sure that if there had been a period of sin or decadence in his life we should have heard about it, and it would have affected his gospel; but never from him do we hear the cry, "Who will deliver me from this body of death?"'

Now that is not a popular doctrine. It does not appeal to the average man. It may be that the average Quaker does not worry about his sins. The average man does. God has made the average man so. Mr. GRAHAM says, and he seems sorry to have to say it, that 'the needs of most people we do not appear to meet.' He had that word in mind when he spoke of the preaching of John Wesley.

For this is how he speaks of John Wesley. 'It has sometimes been said that the failure of Quakerism to reach the masses led to the ground being covered by the Methodist Revival. However efficient Friends had been in their own line of service, I do not think they offered milk for babes. John Wesley, with his terrible preaching of Hell, his cheap salvation (cheap in theory at least), by escape through the merits of another, his stimulating hymns, and his verbal Biblical interpretation, widespread and popular as his teaching has become, could not have done his particular work through any Quakerism true to the name.'

There being no sense of disharmony with God, there is no room for those doctrines which have to do with the reconciliation wrought by Christ. They are openly, even scornfully, rejected by this candid writer. They have never been of any value, and now at last (by the criticism of the New Testament) they are found to be of no authenticity.

So is it with the Atonement. 'The evangelical doctrine of Atonement, as I am using the word historically, ascribed the salvation of mankind here and hereafter to their annexing for themselves, even while yet sinful, the infinite merits of the crucified Redeemer, whose shed blood was regarded as the equivalent in the Divine sight for the sins of the world. This doctrine most people now find incredible, unspiritual, and even immoral.'

Still more so is it with the doctrine of the Trinity. 'It has, of course, no more authority than a Roman Emperor and a Church Council under his presidency and control can give it. It was no part of the thought of Jesus nor of Paul. The two passages where it occurs are interpolations of the usual doctrinal type—the one in 1 John, now deleted, confessedly so; the other, the baptismal formula in the last words of Matthew's Gospel, held so by a large consensus of scholars. But the doctrine represents one of those hard and fast lines of division and classification which are never of more than mere temporary use as scaffolding, and are really in their permanence the bane of theology.'

And most significantly is it so with the Person of Christ. There being no need of a Redeemer, no Redeemer is discovered in the man Christ Jesus. Not because He is not supernatural enough. Mr. GRAHAM has no difficulty in assigning to Jesus all that we care to demand in the matter of the supernatural. For he holds that every human being has powers and possibilities that are quite incalculably supernatural. Mr. GRAHAM is a believer in thought-transference and all the other ideas that are associated with what is called Spiritualism.

'To a mind accustomed to these ideas,' he says, 'there is no difficulty in accepting both the pre-existence and the continued present life of one so remarkable on earth as Jesus of Nazareth. "Before Abraham was, I am"—"Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." These words are easily acceptable. The miracles of healing—of apparently supernatural knowledge or prophecy—of the Transfiguration—present no real difficulty to a psychical researcher's mind. Neither does the Resurrection, understood as Bishop Westcott and Prof. Lake and others understand it, as the raising of a spiritual, not a fleshly, body. On this view the parallel drawn by the apostle gains its validity—"If Christ rose, then we shall rise." Otherwise the apostle's parallel fails.'

In like manner Mr. GRAHAM has no difficulty in accepting the doctrine of Christ's divinity. But he has no use for it. For we are all divine. We all have God dwelling in us. The very purpose of his book is to show the rightness and the reasonableness of the Quaker belief in the indwelling God. Now the indwelling God makes every man a God-man. What advantage, then, has Jesus? He has no advantage beyond the possibility that in Him dwelt more of the fulness of the Godhead.

Nor does Mr. GRAHAM seem to be in the least concerned that in this he is out of touch with the Pauline or other New Testament teaching, for he cannot have forgotten that according to that teaching it is Christ Himself that dwells in our hearts by faith.

The doctrine of the Trinity 'represents one of those hard and fast lines of division and classification which are never of more than mere temporary use as scaffolding, and are really in their permanence the bane of theology.'

It would have been well if Mr. GRAHAM, before he passed that sentence for press, had read the chapter in the Cole Lectures for 1919 on the Social Life of God. The Cole Lectures are delivered before Vanderbilt University. Sixteen courses have now been delivered there. And every course has been successful. For both man and subject have been chosen carefully. The sixteenth course of lectures has been published under the title of *The Productive Beliefs* (Revell; $1.50 net). Rarely have we read a more stimulating book. The author is the Rev. Lynn Harold HOUGH, D.D., President of Northwestern University.

The last chapter is entitled 'The Social Life of God.' Its subject is the Trinity.

But it does not begin with the Trinity. It begins with the most striking fact of to-day—the emergence of the sense of brotherhood. Dr. HOUGH calls it the 'social passion.' 'The social passion,' he says, 'is the pervasive mastering experience of our time. The world is dreaming of brotherhood as it never dreamed of brotherhood before. It has a new and powerful determination to make brotherhood actual in the lives of men. It has an impatience with social injustice, and a determination to right the wrongs which blight human life, which give it a distinctive character. It deeply intends to make the very structure of civilization the support of brotherhood and not in any sense its foe. Man's inhumanity to man is to cease, and society is to become a noble mother to us all.'

What is the source of this longing for brotherhood? Has it any foundation in the nature of things? Passionate enough to-day, is the whole wonderful enthusiasm a passing wave of emotion? If we get back to the last and ultimate reality in the universe, shall we find a basis and a justification for the social passion there? Shall we find its source in God?

Let us study the nature of God that we may see. For 'the very greatest danger to which the social passion is subjected is just the danger which

comes from the suggestion that it is all very beautiful and very noble and very fine, but that it is an entirely impractical and visionary thing. We may be told that it is quite natural for young men who have never had much experience of the actual vicissitudes of life to give themselves with an abandon of enthusiasm to the fight for an achieved brotherhood in the world. But we may be reminded sagely that they will grow older and that the disillusioning experiences of the advancing years will give them a practical poise based upon the apprehension that shimmering sunlit dreams must be tested by the hard stern facts of a very real if a very unlovely world. Now as long as our enthusiasms last we may smile with superior and lofty optimism at such critical suggestions. But the difficulty is that these suggestions come not only from consciously hostile opponents of our position. In a sense they come up from life itself. Even if nobody takes the time to call us visionaries, a long succession of painful and humiliating experiences is likely to put just that word into our own minds.'

Now when we turn to study the nature of God we are at once arrested with this assurance. *There can be nothing of abiding reality in man that is not already in God.* 'If the dream of unselfish brotherhood is something God willed for man without ever possessing it Himself then it can never have the mightiest sanction or the most powerful pressure in our own lives. But if we can carry it back beyond the will of God into the very nature of God then it will be secure for us forever.'

That it belongs to the nature of God is not the private opinion of the Cole lecturer for 1919. It is the repeated declaration of Christ. 'In the memorable intercessory prayer of Jesus which is recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John's Gospel, the Master is praying for the disciples whom He is so soon to leave. He requests with the most profound and deep solicitude, "That they may be one, even as we." And a little later in the same great prayer, He is speaking of all that vast company of those who shall become His followers in the future, and He prays "that they may all be one; even as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us." In a moment He recurs again to the same mastering and dominating idea, "that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one." Now if we are to give any sort of actuality to these words they must mean that the perfect life of the Father and the Son in the harmony of joyously self-forgetful love is to be the type for the life of that brotherhood of loving men which Jesus founded. He sees in the eternal life of God a pattern for the life of men in time. The Godhead is an eternity of mutual life in love, and the Church is to become a reflection of that kind of loving brotherhood.'

We come to the doctrine of the Trinity. What does it mean? It means that 'the life of God has included always the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, three actual persons bound together in the oneness of a perfect life, each perfectly loving the others, each giving Himself in eternal unselfish joy to the others, the very life of God being an eternal glory of sacrificial love.'

Can we entertain such a belief to-day? What would be the value of it? 'The answer comes with a power and a momentum which fairly startles us. If the life of God is an eternal realization of all that we mean by a perfect social organism then the whole conception of society is lifted into new meaning and comes to participate in higher relationships. If the eternal experience of God is built about the actuality of unselfish love, if God Himself perpetually loses His life that He may find it, then it is true that unselfishness is not a soft and vague and impossible dream. It is more real than selfishness. It is more actual than all the hard self-assertiveness of which we know so much. It is as real as the very structure of the universe. It is as real as the nature of God.'

'And now we can afford to be patient. We can afford to wait. Time may seem to be against us. Eternity is on our side. In other words, we do not base our optimism upon a superficial confidence in human nature. We base our confidence upon the very essential quality of the life of God. We know that people have been false. We know that in an environment offering the best sort of opportunity and the noblest stimulus some people will be false. We are not surprised when employers betray workers and workers betray employers. We are not surprised when Peace Conferences are soiled by emerging national and individual selfishness. All these things we understand. All these things we expect. And from the spectacle we look out to that eternal life of God which is perpetually based upon unselfish love. Here we find something solid and dependable. And in every bit of human unselfishness, in every human striving after brotherhood, in every human movement for a more orderly world, we see the expression on the field of this life of that which is the deepest verity in the life of all things. We believe, in spite of sad and heart-breaking experiences, in the triumph of brotherhood here, because we know that the brotherhood which reigns over the whole structure of things must at last come to reign in the life of man.'

Synoptic Variations.

By the Reverend Walter F. Adeney, M.A., D.D., formerly Principal of Lancashire Independent College, Manchester.

The two-document theory of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels has opened up some questions that call for more investigation before the curious phenomena of alternate agreements and differences can be accounted for. I do not refer to the universally acknowledged fact that there is much in Matthew and Luke that cannot be traced either to Mark or to Q—for instance, the infancy stories at the beginning, the resurrection stories at the end, and the large amount of new matter in Luke, now sometimes indicated by the letter S. Nor am I thinking of the great differences in the rendering of some of Christ's sayings, especially the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer, which point to different reports, perhaps two versions of Q (Q^m and Q^l). Over and above these obvious grounds of variations, we are confronted with differences in parallel passages of Matthew and Luke which we attribute to a common source, especially where we take that source to be Mark. How comes it that when Matthew (I use the name for convenience to designate the author of our first Gospel, although we cannot think him to be the Apostle—who may however, perhaps, have collected Papias' Logia, identical with our Q—and so have got his name assigned to the book which contains so much of it) —how comes it that this Matthew and Luke often vary considerably from Mark even when their authority is Mark's Gospel? Dr. Abbott demonstrated in *Clue* that they used a later recension of Mark than those which we have handed down to us in our New Testament. This fact will account for some small points where we find Matthew and Luke agreeing together verbally in modification of Mark's phraseology. But there are many more cases in which they differ from one another as much as from Mark and to a much greater extent. These are the cases which call for attention, and they meet us on every page of the first and third Gospels.

A little consideration will suggest to us that they may conceivably be attributed to five causes —sometimes to one of these, sometimes to another: (*a*) *Literary taste.* One of the greatest merits of our Gospels is their ingenuous simplicity, their artless freedom from self-consciousness. None of the evangelists deal with their material in the manner of the literary historian, as in the case of Gibbon, Macaulay, Carlyle, Froude, writers who, differing greatly in their own mental outfits and habits of thought, shape and colour their materials accordingly. Nevertheless there are clear instances of choice of words, personal mannerisms, and, with all their objectivity and loyalty to truth, individual

sympathies, which have affected their ways of telling the common story. (*b*) *Critical emendation.* In some cases the evangelist may have ventured to omit or alter some detail in his source, because of inaccuracy or for some other objection, solely at the dictation of his own judgment. Every thinking historian does this. A little inquiry will enable us to see whether either Matthew or Luke felt at liberty to do so with Mark, and has, in fact, ever acted in this way. (*c*) *Constructive imagination.* All the four British historians just referred to have exercised this faculty, especially Carlyle, in the most daringly brilliant way, and Froude sometimes with unfortunate results as to objective veracity. It is the duty of the author of a literary historical work to go beyond the mere chronicler in making his characters live and give colour to his narrative. But while this awakens the reader's interest and helps him to realize in his own mind the scenes and persons that are presented to him, it has its dangers. We may be thankful, therefore, that the simplicity and directness of purpose manifested by our evangelists have excluded the free play of this valuable but hazardous constructive imagination; still we cannot affirm that they did not possess or employ a spark of it. This is a matter to be inquired about and looked for when we examine and compare the Gospel texts. (*d*) *Additional sources.* If in some cases the three causes of alteration to which I have referred fail to account for the fact, we may reasonably infer that the evangelists have some other source of information with which they are supplementing Mark. This may be either documentary or oral. Since confessedly both Matthew and Luke did use such sources for whole sections of their Gospels, there is no reason to deny that they may also have employed them for modifying or supplementing material drawn in the main from one particular source, such as Mark. (*e*) *Personal remarks and comments* supplied by the author. These, of course, are pure additions.

Now let us test the applicability of the five principles by taking one or two illustrative cases.

I. Mark i. 1–5; Matt. iii. 1–6; Luke iii. 2–7.

1. Mark begins with a descriptive title of his book (1^1), which, of course, neither of the other evangelists would carry over to his work, especially as neither of them begin it at this point. This comes under (*e*).

2. Immediately after his descriptive title and as an introduction to his account of John the Baptist, Mark quotes some sentences of Old Testament prophecy. Both Matthew and Luke repeat a part of this quotation; but they agree in postponing it till after they have mentioned the coming of John. This is very reasonable, because neither of them is here, like Mark, only beginning his book, so that the peculiar impressiveness of starting with a text of Scripture does not fall in with their plans. Still, we note the coincidence of both of them making this change. A more striking coincidence is to be seen in both of them omitting the first part of Mark's quotation (1^2), for that evangelist had introduced it with an ascription of the whole to Isaiah, whereas this portion is taken from Malachi, and only the second part (1^3) from the prophet to whom he inadvertently attributed the whole. Evidently this is an instance of (*b*)—a critical emendation. Now certainly this second coincidence of Matthew and Luke is remarkable. They may easily both have noticed Mark's lapse of memory and acted independently in their omissions. But, remembering that they were working on the later edition of Mark, perhaps we should surmise that the emendation was due to the editor of that edition, who may have been the evangelist himself correcting and smoothing his own work.

3. Next, following his Scripture quotation, in accordance with his abrupt style, Mark names John and describes his coming and preaching. The other evangelists, not having yet taken over the Scripture quotation, require to give some form of introduction for the Baptist. Both do this with notes of time. Matthew connects his coming with the preceding narrative, merely citing a favourite form of expression, 'in those days.' But Luke here inserts an elaborate reference to contemporary ruling authorities. This is in accordance with his method of connecting the Gospel narrative with world history. It demands no documentary authority. The evangelist falls back on his own knowledge, as an educated man. In both cases we have examples of (*e*)—personal remarks, or, rather, ascribe them to (*d*) as oral traditions.

4. In referring to the locality of John's mission, both Matthew and Luke make additions to Mark. Matthew simply defines the specific wilderness which Mark had mentioned vaguely, saying, 'the wilderness *of Judæa*,' an instance of (*e*), as the evangelist knows that this was the particular

wilderness of John's retreat. But Luke adds that John also came 'into all the region round about Jordan.' Here is additional information. We have not to search for any documentary or traditional authority for it; because further on Mk (1^5) tells us that John was baptizing in the Jordan. Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that he was also preaching there as well as in the wilderness. Luke's statement to this effect is an instance of (*c*), a product of constructive imagination.

5. Where Mark had a new sentence in the indicative—'and preached,' both Matthew and Luke turn this Hebraistic form into the more flowing Greek style by using the participle 'preaching.' Since they agree in doing this, we may again suspect the change to have been made ready for them in their edition of Mark.

6. While Luke follows Mark verbatim in giving the theme of John's preaching as 'the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins,' Matthew has an entirely different construction at this point, omitting any reference to baptism and adding important new matter. First, he has the dramatic form of direct speech — 'saying, Repent ye.' We might regard this as an instance of (*a*), simply a free literary reconstruction of the material, were it not for the sentence which follows, which is entirely new, having nothing corresponding to it in Mark, namely, 'repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' This is the only passage of the New Testament which states that John the Baptist definitely preached the near approach of the Kingdom, though we may say that all the evangelists imply as much by his announcing the advent of the Christ. Both Mark and Luke only give the announcement of the Kingdom being at hand as first appearing in the teaching of Christ. Matthew, and he alone, tells us that John anticipated Jesus, and that when our Lord made this the burden of His message, He was following the Baptist, this evangelist using exactly the same words in describing it. How came Matthew to do so? Is this a case of (*c*)—his constructive imagination? Did he assume without any authority that the phrase which the other Synoptics give as the main substance of the preaching of Jesus was not original, was taken over by the prophet of Nazareth from His predecessor, the prophet of the wilderness? Matthew's free handling of his material and readiness to construct flowing sentences should allow us to admit the possibility of this view. On the other hand, the great importance of the statement may well incline us to think this a case of (*d*). Though it is impossible to say what authority, whether oral or documentary, Matthew was here using, there is some probability that it was Q, since that document is generally thought to have contained an account of the Baptist. The omission of any reference to baptism here, though that is mentioned by Luke after Mark, may well be attributed to (*a*), Matthew throughout giving the greatest prominence to preaching.

7. In his account of John's clothing and food, the coming of the people, and their baptism in the Jordan, Matthew closely follows Mark, varying the phrases according to his own way of writing (*a*), but depending on no other authority. His inclusion of the region of the Jordan among the districts from which the Baptist drew his disciples may well be accounted for by (*c*). Seeing that this was the scene of the baptism, it would be natural to infer that some of its inhabitants were to be found in the crowd of penitents. Luke is very concise here. He briefly epitomizes Mark (*a*), and reserves himself good space for a quantity of new material.

8. For their accounts of the preaching of John the Baptist, Matthew and Luke had to resort to some other authority than Mark, since that evangelist does not record it. In his characteristic way Matthew mentions the two principal parties among the Jews, saying that many of them were coming to John's baptism. This we assign to (*c*), or possibly to (*d*), Matthew having inferred from what he knew of the subsequent followers of John that these people came under his influence, or perhaps having learnt it from tradition, or again perhaps from the document which he is certainly quoting after this. Luke, a Gentile writing for Gentiles, is not so much interested in Jewish sects and parties, and therefore he makes no reference to them there, although he would have had knowledge of the fact which Matthew mentions, if it was in a common source that both evangelists used. Certainly the matter of John's preaching which they both record comes from a common source. As far as Matthew goes, Luke's agreement with him is verbally exact, except for two trivial variations: (1) where for 'fruit worthy' Matthew has singulars (*καρπὸν ἄξιον*), Luke has plurals (*καρποὺς ἀξίους*), and (2) while Matthew (3^9) has 'think not,' Luke (3^8) has 'begin not'—variations which we may easily assign to (*a*). For the rest the verbal

identity proves identity of literary source. This may well have been Q, since there is reason to think that this work included some sayings of John the Baptist. The conversations with various people and the popular impression resulting from it, which Luke (3^{10-15}) alone records, may have been included in the same document, Matthew not choosing to carry on his quotation so far. On the other hand, its being in part concerned with two classes of people to whom elsewhere Luke gives exceptional attention, namely, publicans and soldiers, may incline us to assign it to (*d*) as derived from S.

II. Mark i. 7, 8; Matt. iii. 11, 12; Luke iii. 16–18.

When we come to John's announcement of the coming Christ as reported in the three Synoptics we meet with a complicated problem. First, we have the material common to all three. Matthew and Luke give us everything that is in Mark, and therefore might be credited with using that evangelist as their source. Luke is nearer to Mark in having the idea of unloosing the shoe latchets, while Matthew has that of bearing the shoes. If it were not for Matthew's close verbal agreement with Luke in what follows, we might think that he was using a different authority at this point. But that fact would lead us to assign the variation to (*a*), especially as elsewhere Matthew inclines to generalities where Mark condescends to graphic details. But now we have the agreements between Matthew and Luke where they have not the support of Mark. They both break with Mark's order of sentences, agreeing to put John's reference to his own baptism prior to the declaration of the coming mightier One, while Mark puts that reference after the declaration. This coincidence can hardly be accidental. Then the phrase, 'and with fire,' following 'the Holy Ghost,' in both Matthew and Luke, suggests that the whole sentence in which the two phrases occur comes from one and the same source. If so, we must conclude that, even in that part of it which Mark gives us, the two other Synoptic writers were not following Mark, but were drawing on the source from which they obtained the rest of this speech of John's. Again we may conjecture that this may have been Q. But whether that were the case or not, it would seem that Mark was also using it for so much of the speech as he recorded.

III. Mk. i. 9–11; Matt. iii. 13–17; Lk. iii. 21, 22.

1. The three accounts of the baptism of Jesus may be assigned to Mark as the basal document of each, though with a very free handling of his introductory verse, some striking variations throughout, and some fresh material contributed by Matthew. Instead of the clumsy Hebraistic 'and' (καὶ) and the clause 'in those days,' Matthew begins with 'then' (τότε), and Luke with 'now' (R.V. for δε); Luke then retains Mark's 'it came to pass,' Matthew dropping this Hebraism, and so characteristically abbreviating Mark in narrative and giving space for additions to the sayings. Similarly, Matthew drops Mark's reference to Nazareth, and so does Luke, who also omits Galilee (*a*). On the other hand, Luke states that Jesus was baptized at the time when all the people were baptized, an addition demanding no extra authority, but to be assigned to (*c*) as a natural historical inference characteristically deemed by Luke of human and theological interest. All the other variations at this point may be assigned to (*a*). They are purely literary; unless perhaps we see some further significance in the peculiarity of Luke's account.

2. The conversation in Mt $3^{14.15}$, found neither in Mark nor in Luke, is an instance of (*d*), and it may probably be assigned to Q.

3. The first clause of Mk 1^{10}, 'and straightway coming up out of the water,' is omitted from Luke's briefer account. On the other hand, it is enriched in Matthew's characteristic way by an imaginative filling in of the picture (*c*), and so reads, 'And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway from the water.'

4. The changes in the latter part of Mk 1^{10} are very striking. That evangelist speaks of the vision (1) as seen by Jesus, and (2) His seeing the very process of the heavens being rent open (present participle σχιζομένους). In both these cases the other evangelists state the occurrence objectively, though Matthew preserves a reminiscence of the personal vision in saying, 'the heavens were opened *unto him*,' while Luke only has 'the heaven (singular) was opened.' These alterations may easily be assigned in each case to the author's personal choice of expressions (*a*).

5. In taking over the last clause of the verse in Mark, Matthew has another reminiscence of the vision as a personal experience of Jesus, saying, '*he* saw the Spirit of God,' etc., while Luke is still

purely objective, saying, 'the Holy Ghost descended,' both evidently expressions of the author's own way of regarding the situation and therefore to be assigned to the category (*a*).

Further, Matthew follows Mark in representing the descent of the Spirit 'as a dove' to be a vision of Jesus. But Luke states this objectively—'the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily form as a dove upon him.' He is even remarkably emphatic on this point, inserting the phrase, 'in bodily form.' We may compare this with his materialistic reference in words that he and he alone ascribes to the risen Christ (Lk 24^{39}). We must assign the phrase to the evangelist's constructive imagination (*c*).

6. The last verse in Mark (1^{11}) is taken over verbally by Luke, who only changes 'the heavens' into 'heaven' as before. Matthew retains the former (Hebraistic) form. But he has two variations: (1) The dramatic 'lo' introducing an exclamatory sentence—an instance of (*a*), his own rhetorical construction. (2) Instead of the address of the *Bath kol* to Jesus Himself, in which Luke follows Mark, Matthew has this in the third person—'This is my beloved son,' etc.—another instance of (*a*), possibly due to catechetical repetition.

'I am the Good Shepherd': A Study.

By the Right Reverend John A. F. Gregg, D.D., Bishop of Ossory.

It is not without significance that it is the Fourth Gospel which records the assertion of the claim, 'I am the Good Shepherd.' This is the Gospel in which Jesus is represented as speaking of Himself as the Bread of Life, the Light of the World, the Resurrection, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, the True Vine. These titles show that this Gospel is the Gospel of the Person of Christ as He is for the Church; not, as in the case of the other three, of Christ viewed as far as possible as He appeared in the Earthly Ministry, but of Christ as reflected upon in the light of Resurrection, Ascension, Pentecost, Christian Experience.

And since this is so, the interpretation of the title of Good Shepherd is prescribed for us by its setting. For while on the one hand, as we shall see, it offers a picture quite inadequate beyond a certain point, on the other hand its implications would be narrowed down to falseness, did we restrict them to what the Earthly Ministry manifested Jesus as being and doing.

The assumption of the title during the days of His flesh was mainly proleptic: it would be hardly more than the truth to say that, were it intended to portray Christ as He then was, the picture would have little interest for us to-day.

Two elements in combination were needed for the due realization of the office—the Person, and the Experience; and not until Christ had died and risen had He passed through the only Experience which could fit the Person for His task.

The office of Good Shepherd then is a Post-Resurrection office. It is the recognition of this that has caused the Good Shepherd to be the subject of the Gospel for the Second Sunday after Easter. Involving a personal relation, as is indicated by the fact that the shepherd calls his sheep, knows them, leads them out, suffers for them, it requires the shepherd's presence with his flock and his protecting care of it wheresoever its individual members may be. It is not enough that Christ was once a bright example, a compassionate healer, an inspiring teacher: the Good Shepherd must continue to provide souls with a never-failing rallying-point.

The office further calls for faithfulness and devotion even unto death. But once the shepherd has died for his flock his faithfulness and devotion are memories; he cannot repeat them; they are without effective value when the next crisis comes.

Accordingly, he who is to be the Good Shepherd for mankind must transcend time, place, death, if he is to make good his claim. He must be what the Resurrection alone made Christ, universal, living, penetrating.

I.

The Good Shepherd must be *Universal.*

Something a great deal more extensive is involved than what our Lord could effect as He moved among men during the Ministry. That

Ministry was not central; it was partial, and rigidly limited in scope. It had to do with only a small class of people, and only a small area of territory. 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel'; 'Go not into the way of the Gentiles.' There is His own confession of limitation. When He spoke those words, He was a prophet of the Jews only; He was not yet a world-prophet. He was going to be the Good Shepherd, but He was not so yet, except potentially. He Himself was a Jew. But the world-shepherd must be central, or universal; He must be the property of every people, every place, every age, and that not only in the range of His thought, but in personal approachableness. He must not be local, restricted, or partial. And true universalness could not be reached as long as He was living a mortal life. As long as He was mortal, and (like other mortal men) with His manhood subject to spatial limitations, He did not realize the essential conditions of an All-Shepherd.

II.

The Good Shepherd must possess *Livingness*.

(*a*) It is a noble thing for the shepherd to die for his flock. But the usefulness of such sacrifice is soon exhausted. When he is dead, what of the sheep? Futility may easily be written over a hero's death. The dead man is a spent force. Accordingly a devotion which can surmount death is postulated; a protection which is not merely ready to sacrifice itself, but is in a position to provide without fail the defence which it promises.

Effectiveness is imperative as well as fidelity, and this is secured by the fact that God brought again from the dead the great Shepherd of the Sheep.

(*b*) But in another connexion Livingness is required, the Livingness which gives the Soul-shepherd the freedom of both worlds, the world here and the world beyond. We do not want one who is of service to us while we are on earth, but who has to be left behind when we pass hence in death. We require a Shepherd who is not earthly, but spiritual, one who can follow (or rather, embrace) our spirit, and shelter it as readily when it is out of the body as when it is in the body. And Christ could not fulfil the office of Lord of dead and living while He was yet in the flesh. He only attained to fulness of Livingness when He had passed through death and had come out victorious on the other side. This empowered Him to stand with His feet planted firmly on both worlds.

III.

And yet once again the Good Shepherd must possess *Penetratingness*. That is, he must be able to enter into the hearts and souls of men, in the way of vital fellowship and mystical intimacy. While Jesus was still on earth, it was not possible for men to be 'in Christ' in the sense of 2 Co 5^{17}, 'If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature,' nor again was it possible for Christ to be 'in' men in the sense of Col 1^{27}, 'Christ in you, the hope of glory.' There is no need to dilate upon the impassableness of the inner walls that stand round personality: Christ was fully conscious of it, and it is only the Risen Christ who makes the offer of Rev 3^{20}. And thus, while Christ was in the flesh and not yet ascended, He was among men, He was present with them, but He was not in them. He could influence them, but He did not indwell them. He could call them, but He could not satisfy them. Till He had died out of earthly life, He was shut out from their inner lives by remorseless bars. He could not yet give them life and give it more abundantly. He could not enter into them very much more intimately than one mortal man can enter into another; He was by the very nature of things outside them and alone. And this barrier He could annihilate only by His death; what does He say? 'Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit' (Jn 12^{24}). Christ died and rose, and the result was immediate. Christ was liberated. He came to the disciples by the Holy Ghost, and dwelt in them with the gifts and powers of Pentecost. The resulting change in the disciples was patent to all. The life which had been concentrated and sealed up in Christ before His death was poured out on them then as richly as when the winter frosts relax their grip upon the fountains and the waters flow again with the returning spring. His own witness to the imprisonment that mortal life constituted for Him may be heard in Lk 12^{50}, 'I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!'

Here then we see the Person completed by the Experience. The Soul-shepherd must be Love. But He must be Love that can overstep the centuries and the seas; that possesses the freedom

of the world beyond as of this; that can pierce within the embattled fortress of human personality.

But we must not allow ourselves to think of the Good Shepherd in terms of devotion and sacrifice only. We tend towards sentimentality in this connexion. He seeks a great deal more than to provide us with consolation; the matter does not begin and end with a hedonistic satisfaction for the flock. No shepherd of earth tends his sheep simply for the sake of their physical comfort and well-being. He looks further. The flock is kept for the profit of its owner who proposes to 'eat of the milk of the flock.' Even though the shepherd may hazard his life for his sheep, ultimately they must surrender to their owner, some of them their lives, all of them their wool. Is it otherwise here? The Good Shepherd tends His flock for much more than our private spiritual comfort. He shepherds us for His own high, and often hard, purposes. It is at this point that the allegory breaks down. It is effective only within limits. The relation of the Good Shepherd to human souls is (except in one or two points) altogether beyond that of the shepherd to his sheep. Sheep are mindless creatures, and relation between them and their shepherd there is none, beyond the purely external one of protection on his part, and instinctive response on theirs. All his tending will not bring him and them into closer touch. They stand apart to the end.

But the Good Shepherd tends human souls in order that relation may deepen daily between Him and them, and that relation may ripen into likeness, so that the Shepherd may be reflected in His sheep and be known by men through them. And thus it is that Christ's sheep are tended by Him for His own purposes rather than for their satisfaction. He would have us identify ourselves with these purposes, and seek to be for others what He in His love has been for us. The flock is fed only that it may feed others; it is died for only that it may die for others. That is to say, the flock itself must develop the shepherd-character and spirit; the Good Shepherd looks to His flock to do shepherd-work for Him. This truth is involved in the words to which the allegory leads up, 'Other sheep I have . . . *them also I must bring*.' How does the Shepherd go to bring them? Through and in His flock. The sheep of the Good Shepherd must bring in those other sheep. Such is the truth of the mystical union between Christ and His people, that when He would do a thing to-day, He does it through His Church. And if the Church lags, God's work lags. And therefore, when He speaks of Himself as the Good Shepherd, He has declared for ever the character of tenderness and strength which He wishes to see exhibited in His sheep. He wishes each of us to have the shepherd-heart, to reach out shepherd-hands, to seek the wandering with shepherd-feet, and to pour out for their sakes the shepherd-life. 'Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example.'

It was pointed out that the picture breaks down, when the external relation is exhausted. It needs to be supplemented, if the union between Christ and His people is not to be evacuated of its deepest reality. For example, the relation of a shepherd to his flock is mechanical; that of Christ to His Church is vital. The flock is a collection; the Church is an organism. The shepherd acts from without; Christ from within. The shepherd is a living wall, or hand, or eye; Christ is a beating Heart. And so the picture of the Good Shepherd must be supplemented, or corrected, by that of the Vine and the Branches.

There we have a relation intimate and organic, of the same type as that suggested by the Pauline image of the Head and the Body. So too the picture fails us when we come to the pasturage afforded. The shepherd leads his flock from point to point; the Good Shepherd says, 'I am the Bread of Life.' The relation is again intimate and vital. Apart from the person of the Good Shepherd there is no sustenance; 'Without me, ye can do nothing.'

The picture of the Good Shepherd, then, presents much of Christ, but not all. It tells of Love that shrinks from no sacrifice, and of Love that can follow everywhere and substantiate all its promises.

But there is much that it cannot stretch itself to contain. Of those essential elements of Christian experience, namely, attraction into Christ's likeness, membership of Christ, association with a Master-Friend the inner knowledge of whom is spiritual food, it can say nothing. These elements of the integral conception of what Christ is to His Church must be sought elsewhere.

Literature.

PENANCE.

The Rev. Oscar D. Watkins, M.A., Vicar of S. Cross, Holywell, Oxford, has written *A History of Penance* (Longmans; 42s. net). The book has been published in two handsome octavo volumes. The first volume contains a study of the authorities for the whole Church to A.D. 450; the second for the Western Church from A.D. 450 to A.D. 1215.

What is Penance? It is the power to bind and to loose, the power to remit sins and to retain them. It is that power which the Ascending Lord conferred on His disciples when He breathed on them, and said, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.'

Now it has to be admitted that to many Christians, and even to whole Christian Churches since the Reformation, that commission has been and is still practically a dead letter. They believe, and act steadily on the belief, that no one can forgive sins but God only. To Mr. Watkins it is, next to the Cross, the most significant thing in Christianity. For it is the application to men, and in his sight the only application, of the victory over sin won on the Cross. 'If it be asked,' he says, 'what is the part which men can play in the forgiveness of offence against the majesty of God, it may be answered that in the mysterious wisdom of God it would seem that the fallen human race is required to work out its own redemption. Only as a man will the Divine Word Himself become the Redeemer of the race: and when from Calvary and Hades the risen Lord passes to His place at the right hand of the Father, He leaves upon the earth His chosen officers to apply to the sons of men, each in his several need, the great Atonement which He has wrought for them. When the Lord thus breathes upon the Apostles, He is in the traditional acceptance of the Church to be understood as conveying at that point of time the actual commission which He expresses in words. From that point of time His ministers stand commissioned to remit and to retain the sins of their fellow-men.'

Clearly it is to such a believer a worthy subject for a great book. Mr. Watkins is a historian. He is not a theologian. What the commission involves for theology he does not consider. He is occupied with life. What has it been in the history of the Church?—that is his topic. And that topic he works out with amazing learning. How does a man come to this minute knowledge of the writings of the Fathers?—a knowledge as sure as is the knowledge of Scripture to the best students of the Bible.

Mr. Watkins finds Penance in close contact with Baptism. Is Penance the application of our Lord's commission to those only who have not been baptized, or does it cover also the case of those who have been baptized and have 'fallen from grace'? 'The exercise of the commission in the practice of Penance shows in history the most extraordinary variations. In the first three centuries there is a keen contention as to whether baptized offenders in any of the three capital sins of apostasy, impurity, and bloodshed are or are not admissible to reconciliation in this present life. Hermas (? A.D. 100) indicates that on this point there were already in his time at least two strains of teaching. Some teachers regarded Baptism as the only opportunity of forgiveness for such mortal offences: while others took the view that forgiveness for such offences was readily open even after Baptism. It would seem that a similar tendency to divergence of outlook may be found in the New Testament. The stricter line appears to be taken in the Epistle to the Hebrews: while more lenient practice can be discerned in S. Paul and in S. John. Hermas, while sympathising theoretically with the stricter view, announces a revelation of present mercy to all offending Christians who will repent before a limiting day, a mercy having reference to an imminent persecution and to the approaching end of the age. All the greater writers of the second and early third centuries are found on the side of rigorism. This is the case with Clement of Alexandria, who, however, follows Hermas in mercy to a penitent adulteress: it is no less the case with Hippolytus, with Tertullian, and with Origen. On the other hand, there are bishops of this period who are conspicuous in their advocacy of a more lenient attitude. Such were Dionysius of Corinth; and notably Callistus, who was bishop of Rome from A.D. 218 to A.D. 223. It was to the courageous initiative of Callistus that

was due about the year A.D. 220 the revolution of practice at Rome which admitted the reconciliation of the adulterer, and which in the event will be found to have determined the attitude of the Christian Church in this matter for all future time.'

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEOLOGY.

The Shaping Forces of Modern Religious Thought is the title which the Rev. Archibald B. D. Alexander, D.D., has given to his new book (Maclehose; 14s. net). It is a good title. But the volume might very well have been called by its sub-title, 'A History of Theological Development.' That is no doubt a higher claim; and because it is higher Dr. Alexander did not make it. Yet is it not too high. This is a history; it is a history of theology since the beginning of the Reformation; it is a history of the development of theology, every doctrine being seen in its relation to other doctrines, and the great scientific law of continuity being clearly and impressively revealed. Dr. Alexander has written only some three or four books; for he is too thorough a scholar to be able to write rapidly; and every book has taken its proper place as the authority on its subject. This is the most authoritative of them all. It is likely to be adopted as a text-book in Colleges; it is sure to be kept within reach of the preacher who is a student.

One of the most distinguishing marks of merit in the new book is the unbiassed yet outspoken judgment it pronounces on the great theological movements of the past. Dr. Alexander is unmoved by imperfectly informed opinion of the present day, however great the volume of it. He does justice to Chillingworth as he does justice to Hooker. He does justice to the Puritans as he does justice to the Anglo-Catholics. Here is one representative paragraph: it shows us the historian as we must now insist that the historian ought to be.

'It would be futile to belittle the work of the liberal school, who sought to strike the fetters from the intellect and provide larger room for liberty of worship and religious opinion. But no one can read the works of such men as Hales, Chillingworth and even Jeremy Taylor, and others of this party, without perceiving in what a narrow prescribed area of thought they moved. They have no large horizons. They are occupied for the most part with the little affairs of parochial ecclesiasticism. They meant well, and did excellent work in their own day, but their view was limited. Puritanism was something deeper and broader. It dealt with larger issues. As its outward vestments fell away it revealed the strength and vitality of great fundamental principles. The excrescences of Calvinism, the elevation of the few at the expense of the many, which seemed to some to be the characteristic note of the doctrine of Election, passed into oblivion; but the profounder principles of the Sovereignty of God and the sanctity and vocation of the human soul, with all the vital truths connected with these convictions, lived on and became the permanent contribution of this age to its successors. The greatness of Puritanism, in spite of its inconsistencies, which belonged to its age and environment rather than to its essence, lies in its vivid consciousness of God and the spiritual world and the emphasis it placed on the sacredness and purpose of life as entrusted to man by God.'

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

'That the Resurrection holds the place of centrally determinative importance in the Apostolic Church is a fact which, if not always sufficiently realized by the friends of Christianity in subsequent centuries, is at all events acknowledged by her opponents. D. F. Strauss, *e.g.*, the most trenchant and remorseless of her critics, in dealing with the Resurrection acknowledges that it is the "touch-stone not of lives of Jesus only," but of Christianity itself," that it "touches all Christianity to the quick," and is "decisive for the whole view of Christianity" (*New Life of Jesus*, Eng. tr., 2 vols., London, 1865, i. 41, 397). And P. W. Schmiedel, after recalling the cardinal Pauline doctrines as determined by his belief in the Resurrection, says: "It seems accordingly in logic inevitable that if at any time it should come to be recognized that the resurrection of Jesus never happened, the Christian faith with respect to all the points just mentioned would necessarily come to an end" (*Encycl. Biblica*, iv. 4039). If this goes, all that is vital and essential in Christianity goes; if this remains, all else remains. So it is that through the centuries, from Celsus onwards, the Resurrection has been the storm centre of the attack upon the Christian faith.

'The character of this attack has varied from age to age. To-day it differs in important respects

from what it was even fifteen or twenty years ago. The application of new and more stringent methods of criticism to the evidence, the rich store of new material provided through recent researches in comparative religion and mythology, the re-discovery of Judaistic apocalyptic literature, and the new interest in the psychology of religion—all this has given "a new face" to the critical attack. It is not, indeed, that the apostolic belief in the resurrection of Christ, or the centrality of this belief to Apostolic Christianity, is denied. These are admitted on all sides as incontestable. What is called in question is the validity of the belief, the historical reality of the fact or facts on which the belief was based. It is held that in the light of the new critical methods applied to the evidence and the new knowledge made accessible to us to-day, in the light of what is generally, though ambiguously, called "modern thought," it is no longer possible for us to believe in the Resurrection as the apostles believed in it. In particular, in much present-day discussion it is maintained that, in view of modern scientific-historical criticism of the evidence, it is impossible to believe in the resurrection of Christ in any other sense than that of a spiritual resurrection. The result is that to-day we are faced with this somewhat new situation, that not by the opponents of Christianity only but by some of its most honoured supporters and advocates, in their effort to recommend Christianity to the "modern mind," the bodily resurrection of Christ is denied or minimized as forming no vital or essential part of the Christian faith.'

That is the situation to-day. We have quoted the whole passage from Professor J. M. Shaw's new book on *The Resurrection of Christ* (T. & T. Clark; 9s.). The book is a republication of the article 'Resurrection of Christ' in the DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH, the opportunity being taken to expand and amplify the original article at different points with a view to greater clearness and explicitness of position. That article needs no commendation now.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

The Rev. R. St. John Parry, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, has written an Introduction to and Commentary on *The Pastoral Epistles* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 20s. net). Two things are notable: one that Dr. Parry is a scholar of the first rank, the other that he believes the Pastoral Epistles to be letters which were written, just as we have them, by the Apostle Paul.

Apart from the Introduction, the Commentary is a distinct accession to our materials for the study of the New Testament. It is on the lines made familiar to us by the great Cambridge commentators of last generation, Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort. The outward form is similar; the strong sense of responsibility for the right interpretation of a particle is the same. But there is also advance. The language is now recognized as colloquial, the papyri have been taken account of. Every word is still weighed, but it is weighed with more freedom of movement.

But it is the Introduction that gives the book its significance. Dr. Parry believes that at the end of two years' imprisonment in Rome, St. Paul was released, that he then went on a new missionary journey as far as Spain, that he wrote the Pastoral Epistles at some place or places in the course of that journey, that he was again arrested (probably at Ephesus), taken back to Rome, and suffered martyrdom at the hands of Nero. The arguments which have been urged against the genuineness of these letters are all taken account of, but not directly. Dr. Parry's method is to prove the genuineness, not to disprove the spuriousness. He calls us to come to the epistles with open minds and to consider the circumstances, the style, the atmosphere, and see for ourselves that Pauline authorship is possible, is credible, is probable, is sure.

Take the matter of atmosphere—the most telling of all matters. Nairne was quoted *against* in last month's EXPOSITORY TIMES. Set this beside Nairne: 'It is not reasonable to expect that a private letter, addressed to a personal friend, for his own instruction and consideration, should exhibit the same features as a letter addressed to a community for public, oral communication. If we ask in particular what differences may be expected, we may say, what may be described as a more uniform and quieter style, an absence of declamation, rhetorical argument, impassioned pleading. And, when the friend is also a trusted companion and disciple, versed in the teaching and story of the writer, we shall not expect the elaboration of the elements or even of the greater themes of that teaching: they will be taken for granted or only alluded to: we shall expect references to the

common experience, and intimacies of mutual knowledge. Moreover such a letter will deal directly with the immediate situation: it will leave much untold just because present to the minds of both writer and reader: it will have a large background as clear to them as it is obscure to us. Thus the difference of address will materially affect both the manner and the matter. If these letters closely resembled the earlier letters they would thereby betray the hand of the imitator.

'For many readers it is probably the general impression derived from reading those epistles consecutively after one of the others which gives the feeling that we are in presence of a different writer. But it is just this general difference which is most directly due to the change of address. It is not too much to say that the impression could have been scarcely less strong if these epistles had dealt with the same subjects as those, for instance, of Galatians or Corinthians, but had been addressed to Silvanus or Titus, for their direction in dealing with those Churches. Indeed if we could have possessed such a private letter to compare with the public letters on the same theme the differences in style and expression might easily have been still more startling.'

THE LOLLARD BIBLE.

The Cambridge University Press has undertaken the issue of an important series of works under the editorship of Mr. G. G. Coulton. What is the purpose? Let Mr. Coulton tell us:

'There is only too much truth in the frequent complaint that history, as compared with the physical sciences, is neglected by the modern public. But historians have the remedy in their own hands; choosing problems of equal importance to those of the scientist, and treating them with equal accuracy, they will command equal attention. Those who insist that the proportion of accurately ascertainable facts is smaller in history, and therefore the room for speculation wider, do not thereby establish any essential distinction between truth-seeking in history and truth-seeking in chemistry. The historian, whatever be his subject, is as definitely bound as the chemist "to proclaim certainties as certain, falsehoods as false, and uncertainties as dubious." Those are the words, not of a modern scientist, but of the seventeenth-century monk, Jean Mabillon; they sum up his literary profession of faith. Men will follow us in history as implicitly as they follow the chemist, if only we will form the chemist's habit of marking clearly where our facts end and our inferences begin. Then the public, so far from discouraging our speculations, will most heartily encourage them; for the most positive man of science is always grateful to anyone who, by putting forward a working theory, stimulates further discussion.'

The first volume has been written by Margaret Deanesly, M.A., Mary Bateson Fellow of Newnham College. Its subject is *The Lollard Bible and other Medieval Biblical Versions* (31s. 6d. net). It is a volume of five hundred octavo pages—attractive, scholarly, thorough—the most important work on the English Bible which has been issued for many a day. Miss Deanesly handles her 'monstrous regiment' of facts without feeling of exhaustion or appearance of effort. One reads the book with increasing enjoyment and with deepening interest right on to the end. It is good to have already some knowledge of the English Versions, but it is not necessary.

Among the curious facts clearly brought out is this. There was some consciousness that the reading of the Gospels in a tongue *not* 'understanded of the people' needed explanation. The explanation given in one of the early mass-books, the *Merita Missae* is that merely to hear the reading is edifying though it is not understood, 'just as an adder is affected by the charm pronounced over her, though she does not understand the words.

Though ye understand it nought,
Ye well may wit that God it wrought,
And therefore wisdom were it,
For worship all God's works,
To lewid men that been none clerkes:
This lesson, now go lere it.

And why ye should this lesson lere,
Hearkneth all and ye may hear:
There an adder hauntës,
Ye well may find, and ye will seek,
She understands nothing thy speech,
When thou her endauntës:

Nevertheless, she wots full well
What is thy meaning every deal,
When that thou her enchantës.
So fareth there understanding fails,
The very virtue you all avails,
Through grace that God you grantës.'

HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND.

Canon Wilfrid Richmond has given himself to the thankful task of editing the work left by Professor Scott Holland unpublished at his death. Two distinct books have been issued in one volume, demanding the double title: *The Philosophy of Faith and the Fourth Gospel* (Murray; 12s. net).

To take the last first. The contribution to the study of the Fourth Gospel consists of two Introductions. They were written at different times and they express different conceptions of the Gospel, but they have to be read together if Scott Holland's mind is to be understood. And Mr. Richmond is more concerned that we should understand Scott Holland's mind than that we should understand the Fourth Gospel. Nevertheless these Introductions are good for the understanding of the Gospel. They may give some readers their first firm footing in respect of the authorship of it, they will give every reader new understanding of its majesty.

The first part of the volume is an exposition of Scott Holland's theology. Canon Richmond has used his published works (almost all volumes of sermons), including sermons published in the *Christian World Pulpit*, and in a masterly way he has quoted from them, introducing his own hand as rarely as possible, and so arranging the quotations that we see quite clearly and instructively what were the beliefs on which Scott Holland lived and died.

THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL.

It is a firm principle in historical writing that the history of a movement should be written by one who is in sympathy with it. The Rev. S. Baring-Gould, M.A., who writes the history of *The Evangelical Revival* (Methuen; 16s. net), is not in sympathy. The consequence is a perpetual sense of irritation. Nothing is right. All the seamy side is turned up. And the reader at last concludes that the Evangelical Revival was the sorriest effort of men and women to follow the mind of Christ in all the history of Christianity—if Mr. Baring-Gould is a faithful and true historian.

Now it may be admitted that the Evangelical Revival needed a sympathetic historian. It has also to be admitted, however, from the other side, that few movements repay sympathetic treatment better. Why, then, did Mr. Baring-Gould undertake to write its history? Partly, we think, because he has an interest in psychology as it is to be studied on its religious side, but chiefly because he desired to show that the hymn is all wrong which says that 'God moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform.' He moves, Mr. Baring-Gould believes, in a perfectly natural straightforward businesslike way, and has no wonders whatever to perform. In older days he would have used strong words of 'enthusiasm'; in these days he uses strong words of 'abnormal spiritual phenomena.' All is to him normal and natural. Conversion 'is no miracle, it is a produce of natural processes, the materials have been accumulating since infancy. We do not dispute that it is God who is the cause; for He made man, and gave to his spirit the faculty of incubation of all that is necessary for the final explosion.' 'To entertain the idea, so general in Wesleyanism, that Conversion is due to the miraculous interposition of God, to a sudden descent of the Holy Spirit on a man, instantaneously changing his heart, is not in accordance with psychology. We know that all the elements conducing to this phenomenon have been accumulating and ripening for the convulsion.'

LAFAYETTE.

To their excellent and successful series 'The "True" Biographies and Histories,' Messrs. Lippincott have added a volume on Lafayette. The title is *The True La Fayette* (10s. 6d.). The author is Mr. George Morgan.

It is a volume of nearly five hundred pages, and it is fully furnished with index and illustrations—quite enough to show the world how grateful even yet the American nation is to the wealthy French aristocrat who threw himself and his money into their struggle for democratic freedom. Mr. Morgan writes with a grave sense of the importance of his subject. His admiration for Lafayette is able to lift him over all the difficult places in his career. He has too high a feeling for the grandeur of biography to deny the existence of faults and failings. But they disappear in the general greatness of the man, his disinterestedness, his loyalty to the cause which it seemed so impossible that he could ever really believe in. How much of his enthusiasm was due to sheer love of adventure, and how much to sheer hatred of the British, is as impossible now to estimate as it is needless.

The volume is national. It is a nation's offering to one whom it will always delight to honour. It is a full commentary on the words of General Pershing at Lafayette's tomb. 'One may be pardoned for recalling the exact circumstances of the incident referred to. The situation was simple. All clouds, all complexities (if not all doubts) had been swept away when the United States resolved to strike for the liberties of mankind. The enemy, by reason of enormous successes in the East, was concentrating in the West. His submarines were in the full fiendishness of their activity. Then it was that General John J. Pershing, Commander-in-chief of the American Expeditionary Forces, having arrived in France with the vanguard of our overseas army of two millions of men, made a pilgrimage in Paris to Picpus Cemetery and, standing by one of the tombs, said reverently: "*La Fayette, we are here.*" That utterance—those four words—meant much to us and a great deal to the hard-pressed French. One meaning was that we were about to pay something of our inextinguishable debt to France. Another meaning was that America, with its three millions in young La Fayette's time, had enlisted, with its one hundred millions, in the very cause La Fayette had championed.'

'A Brief Account of the Freudian Theory' called *Psycho-Analysis* has been given by Miss Barbara Low, B.A. (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). It is also an intelligible account—no small achievement. The style is simple and the examples are numerous. What Psycho-Analysis means no one need any longer be ignorant of. Miss Low is no doubt keen to make converts, for she is an ardent disciple of Freud. And there is no reason why she should not make them. There is no pseudo-scientific occultism here. There is no danger to the balance of the mind. Rather is there healing and help in this scientific exposition of the ways of 'the Unconscious.' And there is sometimes a wholesome humour. 'As an instance of the Unconscious working through a so-called "slip of the tongue," Freud gives us this case: a doctor, who had been treating a wealthy patient, now convalescent, began cheering her with the prospect of an expedition to the country very soon, and the pleasures she might look forward to, ending up with, "You will be able to have a very pleasant time if, as I hope, you will *not* soon be able to leave your bed."'

The Christian life is a life of progress, and the progress is a process of letting go and holding on. Some things we let go. What are they? Dr. Anna Robertson Brown says they are pretence, worry, discontent, and self-seeking. What are the things we keep hold of? They are work, happiness, common duties, friendship, sorrow, faith. It is all fully set forth in one of Mr. Allenson's 'Heart and Life' booklets entitled *What is Worth While?* (1s. net).

The wise pastor is the pastor of the children. The Rev. H. G. Tunnicliff, B.A., gives the best of his brains and the tenderest of his sympathies to the feeding of the lambs. He will be rewarded. After issuing three or four volumes of children's sermons he has become ambitious and has published a new Children's Pilgrim's Progress, calling it *The Road of Adventures* (Allenson; 2s. 6d. net).

There is not a children's address that is more effective than the parable. It catches the attention, it remains in the memory, it carries its lesson home. If only it were easier to tell a parable. The Rev. W. T. Tutton has the gift. He is short, simple, direct, natural. His book of parables called *The Box and the Bird* (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net) is good for reading as well as for preaching.

The importance of the Comparative Study of Religions is being recognized at last. Missionaries have discovered that the first demand made upon them is to understand the religion they have gone to supersede. Preachers at home have learned that nothing has been more effective in winning their most intelligent young people away than the popular belief, so industriously advocated in press and on platform, that one religion is just as good as another. One of the signs of the awakening is the circulation of the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Another is the issue of an 'Introduction to the Study of Religions,' by Principal A. E. Garvie of New College, London. It is an excellent book for the purpose. To the missionary it will be especially instructive. And it is written with ample knowledge and enthusiasm. The title is *Tutors unto Christ* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net).

Why do we behave well? Mr. Stephen Ward does not deny that we do, sometimes. Why? He answers, Because we have one natural endowment called Activity, and we learn to exercise it in a way that is good—good for others and so for ourselves. Knowledge, then, applied to Activity—that is the way.

And in that way we make progress. The whole world makes progress. 'It is not fifty years ago that Queen Victoria wrote of the women who advocated female suffrage—a mild and unobtrusive body in those days—that they ought to be whipped. That is, a hard-working and high-principled lady saw nothing shocking in advocating such punishment for her own sex on account of a harmless doctrine. To-day, most of us are eager to accommodate; we are not so sure we are right, or that there is only one way of doing things. But this is not the consequence of greater morality; we hesitate to speak on this matter with the conviction of our fathers. It is due to greater enlightenment, greater common sense.'

Mr. Ward does not altogether ignore Christ. 'With an originality striking in his own time and circumstances he seized upon a salient characteristic of human nature, the mutual give and take whereby men live in harmony. By an arrangement with his master's debtors the unjust steward contrives that in the event of his dismissal he shall fall upon his feet.' But he must look at Christ again. His book is *The Ways of Life: A Study in Ethics* (Oxford University Press; 6s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Dent have reissued Mr. Clement K. Shorter's book on 'George Borrow and his Circle' in their Wayfarer's Library and have given it the title of *The Life of George Borrow* (2s. net), thereby pleasing the author and increasing the number of his readers. And the book is well worthy both of its place in this series and of its new name. The two-volume life of Borrow by Dr. Knapp is far from satisfactory, as Mr. Shorter himself makes very manifest. We demand to know every man at his best, not at his worst. And with this man the best and the worst were far apart.

All that is known, and all that needs to be known, about *Girls' Clubs, their Organization and Management*, is contained in Miss Helen J. Ferris's book with that title (Dent; 8s. net). It is an American book, by an American author, and it is American through and through. But that only serves to make it complete and suggestive. For Girls' Clubs are a great institution in the United States of America, and all the rest of the world must sit at the feet of the American 'Leader' and be taught. Moreover, there is a future to be prepared for, a future with momentous possibilities. Very business-like is Miss Ferris throughout. There is plenty of fun, but there is no silliness. The very illustrations are an education in the fulness, the freedom, and the responsibility of girl life.

He would be a foolish Roman, and he would be a more foolish Protestant, who took exception to Mr. J. E. Rattenbury's *Roman Errors and Protestant Truths* (Epworth Press; 2s. net). For the tone of the book is beyond cavil, as the facts it contains are beyond controversy.

The Problem of Christian Ethics (Epworth Press; 3s.)—is not that the problem of our time? For the question for us is not what we should do, but why we should do it. And that brings in Christianity. Why should we do this and refrain from that? The answer is because God requires it of us, and God is seen in the face of Jesus Christ. That is why we urge religion upon men, that is why we urge the Christian religion. The Rev. Ernest W. Young, M.A., has brought it all out most attractively in his Thesis with that title, and he has sent it home to our heart and conscience by many a well-chosen literary illustration.

Mr. F. W. Boreham's new book is entitled *A Bunch of Everlastings* (Epworth Press; 6s. net). It is described openly on the title-page as 'a volume of sermons.' Is Mr. Boreham able to preach such sermons as these—exactly as they are printed here—and is his congregation able to receive them? Their interest is undoubted and even intense. For Mr. Boreham is an artist. Thoughts are not thrown down as they occur, nor are they clothed in the words that they happen to catch hold of. Every sermon is constructed. Every thought is in its place and properly expressed. And there are no marks left of the constructing. To the literary student as to the average hearer of sermons every sermon is literature. And every sermon is more.

For in every sermon the Gospel is contained. And yet more. In every sermon the Gospel is sent home to heart and to conscience with quite unusual force. The end of preaching is persuasion, and that end is not for one moment forgotten by Mr. Boreham. Oh yes, he preached these sermons, and you or I could preach them, if only they were ours.

This volume is occupied entirely with the texts which were the power of God unto salvation of certain great men — Thomas Chalmers's Text, Martin Luther's Text, and all the rest.

Mr. G. Watt Smith, M.A., has begun with the Nineteenth Century and gone back, century after century, to the First, showing popularly who were the great men and what the characteristics of each century since Christ came. His title is *Men and Marks of the Christian Era* (Gardner). The Nineteenth Century was the century of Science, its great men were James Watt and Sir James Simpson. The Fifteenth Century was the century of the Printing Press. Its leading men were John Hus, Jerome of Prague, Fust, Gutenberg, and Savonarola.

The Jewish Publication Society of Philadelphia has in hand a series of volumes describing 'Movements in Judaism.' 'Zionism,' by Professor Gottheil, has already been published. Now *Hellenism*, by Dr. Norman Bentwich, is out. Others to follow are 'Mysticism,' by Chief Rabbi Hertz; 'Rationalism,' by Dr. Isaac Husik; and 'Reform Judaism,' by Dr. Schulman.

The volume on Hellenism is as necessary as any of them. For Dr. Bentwich's subject is not Hellenism in its influence on Christ or St. Paul, though that also is in some need of exposition. It is Hellenism as representing the culture of the ancient world in its conflict with and its entrance into Rabbinic Judaism, a much more rarely discussed subject. So the value of the book is first of all for the student of Judaism. And Dr. Bentwich is an unbiassed guide who knows the way. He writes as an historian, not as an apologist. But the value of the book does not end there. It is, after all, the student of the Pauline Epistles who will find most profit in it. Here is one expressive sentence: 'The mission of Paul marks the radical conversion of the ethical Hebraic teaching of Jesus into a new Hellenistic religion, in which the theology of the advanced Alexandrian reformers takes the place of the life according to the Jewish law as the basis of union. "The letter which is the law kills and leads to death. The spirit which is the Lord gives life and leads Godwards."'

It never rains but it pours — Commentaries. We all know that Canon Charles has finished a Commentary on the Apocalypse for the 'International Critical' series—a Commentary which is to be issued immediately in two volumes. Only a month ago a handsome volume came from America, mostly of Introduction. This month we have *The Revelation of John* (Johnson; 6s. net) by Professor A. S. Peake, both Introduction and Commentary and a work of the first importance.

Professor Peake chose the Apocalypse when invited to deliver the nineteenth Hartley Lecture. Now the Hartley Lecture, if we mistake not, is delivered at a sitting, whereas this is a volume of four hundred pages. What is the meaning of it? The meaning of it is that the book contains a full introduction as well as a fairly full exposition of the Book of Revelation, and yet has all the 'readableness' of the popular lecture.

It is enough to add that until Charles comes Peake tells us all that is known about the Apocalypse. Scholarship and Sanity—both in full flower—these are its characteristics.

Platform speakers, in order to get into touch with their audience, used to begin by denouncing the Devil. The writers of books have caught the trick. Their Devil is John Calvin. It is enough to mention the name. From Catholic to Quaker, Calvin and Calvinism have for a generation been the anathema of anathemas. And now a Christian and a scholar, the Rev. A. Mitchell Hunter, M.A., has the audacity to write a great book on *The Teaching of Calvin* (Maclehose; 10s. 6d. net).

A great book? You have not often, in theology, stumbled upon a greater. Mr. Hunter is master of a gloriously masterful style—clear as crystal, momentous as a steam engine. If he had been a writer of literary essays all the critics would have called his book great. Much more than that, he is a writer on a subject which itself is great—he proves it to be great—one of the greatest ever occupying the attention of man's mind, and he rises to the greatness of it.

He is not a slavish Calvinist. Who could be? Who could be a slavish Augustinian, or even a slavish Newmanite? In one generation we can go higher than any man has gone. How much more in four centuries! But he does this for Calvin. He makes it impossible for any man to speak disrespectfully of his head or his heart. And he does this for Calvinism. He makes it dangerous for any man to mention the word, on platform or in press, until he has read and reckoned with this book.

Professor R. M. Maciver, D.Phil. of the University of Toronto, wrote his book *Community* (Macmillan) to prove that sociology is a science. The book has already reached a second edition, and in the preface to that edition he avows that purpose is an unmistakable challenge. 'Is sociology a real science, or only a bundle of snippets hung on a thread of good intentions? I hold it to be a real science, still in its infancy. And this book is to be judged by its degree of success in suggesting the subject-matter of that science. If its contents can be divided up so that this part can be assigned to psychology, this to economics, this to politics, and so on, then the quest has been in vain.'

It has not been in vain. The reviewers have approved of the book, the buyers of books have bought it, its readers have discovered a new science and rejoiced in the discovery. As an introduction to the study of the science of Sociology the book will not easily be surpassed.

Mr. Owen Wister is a citizen of the United States of America and he has quite a good opinion of his country and people. 'Owing to one thing and another we are cleaner, honester, humaner, and whiter than any people on the continent of Europe. If any nation on the continent of Europe has ever behaved with the generosity and magnanimity that we have shown to Cuba, I have yet to learn of it. They jeered at us about Cuba, did the Europeans of the continent. Their papers stuck their tongues in their cheeks. Of course our fine sentiments were all sham, they said. Of course we intended to swallow Cuba, and never had intended anything else. And when General Leonard Wood came away from Cuba, having made Havana healthy, having brought order out of chaos on the island, and we left Cuba independent, Europe jeered on. That dear old Europe!'

Is his book then simply a glorifying of ourselves? It is nothing of the sort. What we have quoted from it is there to show the American people how needless it is of them (being so great) to be jealous of the people of Great Britain. The title is *A Straight Deal; or, The Ancient Grudge* (Macmillan; 6s. net). It is a forcibly written, highly courageous, and firmly patriotic book.

Last month was noticed here a great book on China by the late James W. Bashford, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This month there comes out a volume of sermons and addresses by Bishop Bashford. Most of its contents are addressed to students in training for the ministry. And even the more apparently popular discourse is likely to be most profitable to preachers. This seems to have been the call to which Bishop Bashford responded. He determined not merely himself to discover 'latent saints,' as Christina Rossetti would say, but to send saints out in the discovery of other saints. If he addresses theological students, it is never to make them theologians: always is it to make them witnesses. If he preaches an apparently popular sermon it is to make every man and woman who hears him a servant of the Lord Jesus Christ. The volume contains twelve full thoughtful stirring discourses. Its title is *The Demand for Christ* (Methodist Book Concern; $1.50 net).

One of the essays in Professor Henry C. Sheldon's volume of 'Essays in Philosophy and Religion,' entitled *Pantheistic Dilemmas* (Methodist Book Concern; $2.50 net), is concerned with the truth and error of Mysticism. And, as is the way with writers on Mysticism, Professor Sheldon gives a list of definitions. It has the usual result. Not two of the writers agree together. One man says it is 'the assertion of an intuition which transcends the temporal categories of the understanding.' Another says it is a belief in a God who answers prayer. Dr. Sheldon's own definition is this: 'Mysticism stands first of all for a very pronounced theory and faith relative to the possibilities of intercommunion between the soul and God; secondarily it stands for a very pronounced theory and faith respecting the significance of nature as the veil, robe, or symbolical expression

of a transcendent reality.' The essay is then an exposition of the first part of that definition, the second part being used as introduction to it.

The volume is made up of essays that are independent but all concerned with living issues. There is one on Pragmatism and another on Bergsonism (if that word is lawful) which will give the beginner in the study of modern philosophy a very fair idea of those two isms. Dr. Sheldon is a severe critic of both systems.

What is Christianity? Mr. Carl K. Mahoney says it is one of two things. Either it is 'that set of teachings promulgated by Jesus Christ and his disciples, especially those of Christ himself, and embodied in the New Testament Scriptures.' Or it is 'the social organism growing out of the movement started by Christ in the world, an organism seeking to follow in its development the principles that he taught, and striving, with a greater or less measure of success, to attain unto the standards of life which he set up.' Now it is certain—it ought to be certain by this time—that Christianity is neither the one nor the other. Christianity is Christ. A man may accept the teachings of Christ and try to live by them; he may also be a loyal member of the Church of Christ; and yet he may not be a Christian. To be a Christian is to have Christ in the heart by faith. Why, then, does Mr. Mahoney limit his definition to the teaching and the social organism? Because he is a psychologist and his purpose in the book entitled *Social Evolution and the Development of Religion* (Methodist Book Concern; $1.25) is 'to present the results of a study of religion from the standpoint of social psychology.' Now 'the psychologist in the field of religion does not discuss the supernatural at length because it lies without his province. It lies in the realm of the theologian.' Well, it is all right and excellent as an adjunct. But it is not, and Mr. Mahoney knows that it is not, Christianity. Listen to this: 'Too much is made of Greek and Roman influences upon the growth of Christianity. Not enough has been made of those influences that had their genesis in the personal life of Jesus Christ, that sprang fresh and new from the depth of his being. Out of his personal life came the determinative dynamic elements and factors of the Christian religion and its development.'

Primary Visitation Charges are not as a rule exhilarating reading. But the charge given by Lord William Cecil on his primary visitation of the Diocese of Exeter will both stimulate and astonish. Dullness?—there is not a dull sentence in it. The Bishop gives expression to every thought of his heart, and the thoughts of Lord William Cecil's heart are very active and even revolutionary. First comes the subject of 'The Temporalities of the Church.' He says: 'I should like the funds of the diocese to be regarded as belonging to the diocese and not to individual parishes, and I would not exclude either the incomes of the capitular bodies or the Episcopate. Out of that fund the incomes should be from time to time distributed according to the needs of the diocese. The incomes of the Canons might be transferred to the Archdeacons. For I am convinced that endowed Archdeaconries would contribute far more to the efficiency of the Church than any increase in the Episcopate. I would even like to see the income of the Deans apportioned to the Suffragan Bishops. Suffragan Bishops have, as a rule, no endowment while Archdeacons receive sums which barely pay their expenses. Yet on the splendid work of the Suffragan and the Archdeacons the whole efficiency of the Church depends.'

Is that all? There is more than that. 'I have every regard for the Cathedral Chapters, but we cannot truthfully say that their office is in any way indispensable to the Church. If they adorn the Church it is from their own intrinsic merits. I cannot see why such a reasonable reform as to unite the offices of Archdeacon and Canon, and by leaving the Bishop to be his own Dean as he is in many dioceses to use the income of the Deanery to supply a Suffragan, should be regarded as a radical measure, due regard being paid to all life interests. I will not touch on the income of the Episcopate as it would seem to be a personal subject, but I will merely say that in any scheme of a Redistribution Fund the Episcopal incomes would have to be redistributed with the rest. But I am on sure ground when I say that such a measure would augment the usefulness of the Church in the parishes. We should get a body of well-paid men doing adequate work; unburdened with the sense of poverty, they could throw their whole energies into that which they have chosen as their life's work, preaching the Gospel.'

This Charge will be read. Its title is *Difficulties and Duties* (Nisbet; 4s. 6d. net).

The Way of Health, by Charles W. Budden, M.D. (Pilgrim Press; 4s. net), is further described as 'Plain Counsels in Personal Hygiene.' And so far there is nothing likely to catch the attention of the man or woman who turns over the books on the bookseller's counter. A glance inside, however, discovers coloured illustrations, clever enough to arrest the eye, and mysterious enough to insist on further examination. The reading of the book follows. And then the surprised and delighted reader is found wondering why these things, so necessary that he should be aware of, and so imperative that he should attend to, if he is to do his work in the world, were not taught him at school, and made part of the daily and hourly practice of his life. Dr. Budden has a rare gift, or rather combination of gifts. He knows his subject practically and he can impart his knowledge most persuasively. We would encourage him to write yet another book on the body—a full and serviceable manual of health to be used by teachers. But for the instruction of the average man or woman this book could scarcely be surpassed.

For the better attendance at Holy Communion, and especially for the greater profit of that attendance, the Rev. Cecil J. Chesshire, M.A., has written a convenient manual of devotion, calling it *Holy Communion on Holy Days and Saints' Days* (Scott; 4s. net). He believes that we profit best when we obtain a single leading thought out of the Scripture Lesson and then turn that thought into the three great purposes of a Eucharist-Adoration or thanksgiving, Supplication or pleading the merits of the Cross, and Prayer for special grace, whether for ourselves or for others. His aim is to suggest the leading thought. And in that aim he is sure to be successful, if we use his little book with the sincerity it deserves.

Messrs. Scribner have issued an edition in America of Professor H. A. A. Kennedy's *The Theology of the Epistles* ($1.35). The book has already been reviewed. But it is right to say that the American is more attractive than the English edition.

Mr. Henry J. Cadbury holds that the Old Testament is the literature of the Hebrew nation, and that the Hebrew nation came into existence as a fusion of Israelites and Amorites (called also Canaanites). His interest is not in the wars and migrations which brought the Hebrew nation into existence. It is in the ideals which the nation held and which made it so great a power, though so small a people, in the history of the world.

There are three ways of regarding the history of the world. It may be looked upon as the unfolding of a Divine plan which man is powerless to alter: that is the apocalyptic way. It may be regarded as the playground of material forces—economic, military, political: that is the materialistic way. It may be considered as the operation of spiritual forces and ideals: the spiritual way. Mr. Cadbury believes that the history of the Hebrews, as it is found in the Old Testament, is the best example of the third way which the world has seen. And it is his endeavour in the book entitled *National Ideals in the Old Testament* (Scribners; $1.75) to describe these ideals and to estimate their value for mankind. There is a certain freshness, if not originality, in the conception: in the working out of it there is an undeniable originality, and that not of words but of thought and stimulus to thought.

Messrs. Scribner are the publishers of a volume on the *History of the Hebrew Commonwealth* ($2) written by Albert Edward Bailey, Director of Religious Education in Worcester Academy, and Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D., Litt.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University—a volume of scholarship and practical value. Its practical value as a teacher's handbook to the Old Testament is evident in the turning of its pages. On every other page there is a clear reproduction of some ancient tablet or modern photograph, illustrating the narrative in which it is set, and at once making that narrative alive with intelligence. A glance at the end of the book confirms the impression of its usefulness. There we discover eight-and-twenty maps, coloured in the most eye-arresting manner, and absolutely up to date in accuracy. As the story is told, the pupil is plied with questions. They also are practical and up to date. Below a number of photographs from the monuments of Aramean, Hittite, Hebrew, and other faces, we find this list: 'What similarities of feature do you discover in these types? Is there

any especially intellectual countenance? Are there any evidences of refinement or spirituality? Are any of the men strong-willed? Are any physical weaklings? Pick out specimens that are fit to be world conquerors. Any that would make religious fanatics. Imagine these men living in America to-day: what kinds of citizens would they become, and what would be their probable occupations?' Perhaps Director Bailey and Professor Foster will publish the answers of the smart American boy.

On the 24th day of June 1908, at one of the sittings of the Pan-Anglican Congress, a special offering was made for Foreign Missions. The sum contributed was £352,000. How was that sum spent? The whole story is told in *The Spending of a Thank-Offering*, a handsome illustrated volume, edited by Aubrey Baskerville Mynors, M.A., and published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (4s. cloth, 2s. 6d. paper, net).

Mr. Arthur Herald's *Essays in Moderation* (Swarthmore Press; 5s. net) are chiefly essays in Utopianism. The last half of the book is deliberately given to the description of a perfect State. Only the first essay deals directly with Moderation. It is a sermon on the text, 'Let your moderation be known unto all men' (Ph 4[5]). Mr. Herald takes the word to mean 'a proper sense of proportion' or the putting of first things first.

'One great weakness of the churches at the present time is that we are still groping after a theology which is at once simple and profound, loyal to the historic revelation and loyal to the manifestations of truth in modern science—a theology which would interpret life's meaning and purpose as clearly as Calvinism used to do or as Marxism does—a theology which will satisfy the mind and stir the heart—a theology that can be preached.'

The Rev. Herbert G. Wood, M.A., does not profess to supply this theology or to be able to supply it. But in the Swarthmore Lecture for 1920 on *Quakerism and the Future of the Church* (Swarthmore Press; 1s. 6d. net) he does very clearly open the way for it. He shows that 'all the leading ideas of the older theology have broken down in the form in which they used to be presented. The idea of the sovereignty of God and of predestination and election have to be reshaped. The doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin, of a substitutionary Atonement and of Eternal Punishment are no longer believed and can no longer be preached. The popular conception of the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures can no longer be maintained.' But he shows just as clearly that the theologian who tosses all these doctrines aside and offers no substitute for them is not the theologian that we are in search of.

Nicodemus.

By the Reverend George Steven, D.D., Edinburgh.

It is of importance for the understanding of this story that we keep in mind throughout the position of Nicodemus and the high esteem in which he must have been held by his fellow-countrymen. He was not only a man of education and blameless character, but of such marked ability that he had been chosen a member of the Sanhedrim, the highest civil and ecclesiastical court of the land. This position of honour and influence it was his duty to maintain. It has been customary to despise him for visiting Jesus under cover of the darkness, yet there are not many men among us of high place and repute who would not shrink from what they might think was compromising themselves by showing openly an interest in a movement which was limited to the lower classes, and was said by the more influential people of the time to be subversive of the national faith.

It is of importance also that we have a clear conception of the motive which led Nicodemus to visit Jesus at all. As is manifest from the Gospels, our Lord's work and teaching were causing great discussions everywhere, and Nicodemus may have taken part in them. At any rate he confessed he

knew what they were, and had formed his own conclusions about them. Many motives have been ascribed to him of one kind or another, but I am inclined to believe from the turn of the conversation that he was moved by a purely intellectual curiosity, which Jesus with His unerring intuition into human character perceived at once. Nicodemus wished to understand what this new movement meant, wished to get to the heart of it, to study it and to study it at the source. Moreover, he knew that a private conversation was the best method of attaining his object. Yet his high position and his sense that he was stooping from it were against his getting at any real comprehension of Jesus. Very few men of education and refinement can lightly put aside what it has cost them a whole lifetime to build up, so as to listen with an open mind to what a young working-man from a country village has got to say about the very subject which they have studied most deeply. In addition to that, the very religion of the Pharisee would make it difficult for him to listen with appreciation to the new teaching. He had been trained from his earliest days in the law, to believe that men were saved by strict obedience to commandments, to reverence the traditions of the elders, to shape his whole conduct by a complicated system of rules. He therefore had an idea of God which closed his mind against the free spirit of Jesus. And a false idea is as blinding as sin. Now an intellectual interest in religious movements is attractive, even fascinating, and wholly legitimate, but to come with a prejudiced mind to the study of anything, not to speak of religion, prevents any intimate knowledge of it. I suspect that Nicodemus, while he was interested, was, like other Pharisees, wholly satisfied that the law was the only divine means of saving a man's soul. And to be satisfied with our religious attainments is fatal.

Through the dark streets of Jerusalem Nicodemus stole along until he reached the house where Jesus lodged. He entered, and was in the presence of the Son of God. Sitting in the dimly lit room, they talked together, while the wind blew where it listed, and they heard the sound of it beating on the casement. Nicodemus opened the conversation, and, we may frankly admit, opened it diplomatically by a kindly reference to Jesus' teaching and work, 'We know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these signs thou doest except God be with him.' It would have been easy for Jesus, if He had been so minded, to lead on from the vantage ground thus given Him to deeper matters. He had done so with Simon the son of Jonas, when, taking him at his best, He called the impulsive man of action a 'rock'—no longer impulsive but immovable. He had done so also with Nathanael the mystic, and had promised him still richer visions than those he had had under the fig-tree, yet steadied them by resting them all on the fact of the Son of man. Why then did He pull Nicodemus up sharp, preventing him from even so much as putting the question he had come to ask? Was there something in his manner or in his tone that revealed him? Or was the man sincere who said that Jesus was a teacher come from God, and yet could not talk with Him in broad daylight? Whatever it was that moved him, our Lord at once checked the speech by what seems an irrelevant reply: 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' This would seem to mean: 'There is no use of our discussing the matter, for we have no common ground to go upon; no one can discuss it until he has had experience of it: it is a matter not for discussing, but for inward seeing.' As we are all aware there are certain facts in life which cannot be explained, because they are ultimate facts and must simply be accepted—such as life, love, fear, hope; we cannot analyse them. An illustration or two will bring the truth of this home to our minds. Take a landscape. Have you ever been in the presence of a fine sunset, and at the same time in the company of one who had no sense of beauty? You speak to him of what you see and feel, of what moves you deeply, and he answers you that he does not understand your emotion. You do not argue the matter with him, you only regret that your friend is beauty-blind. A company were once sailing up one of the famous rivers of America, and some of them were breaking out from time to time in admiration of the splendour of the scene that was passing before them. A wealthy American was of the number, who after listening for a time cried out: 'What are you all raving about?' Then sweeping his arm across the scene, added: 'I would not give fifty dollars for five miles of it.' The others were silent, and one of them who told the story was sorry for the poor creature. The man did not *see* it—that was all, but how much it was! Turner, the famous painter was busy painting a picture in the presence of a lady friend, who kept watching

and comparing the landscape and the picture as it took shape under Turner's creative hand. At last she exclaimed, 'Mr. Turner, I don't see that!' He stopped, looked at her for a moment, and answered, 'But, madam, don't you wish you could?' His question rendered debate needless. It is the same with music and with poetry. What thrills one soul leaves another cold. 'Daffodils, That come before the swallow dares and take The winds of March with beauty,'—these words of Shakespeare will be nothing particular to one man, and will haunt the mind of another for ever. There is something even more marvellous than these. There are men and women among us to-night who love most of all the friendless, the degraded, and the lost souls of your city, who are restless in their own comforts, who have felt the fascination of Home Mission work, and give their time, their strength, their all to save them. As men of the world observe them, they are amazed or amused, counting it hopeless work. The reason is they have not been quickened by the divine power of Christ's compassion for men, and have not had their eyes anointed with salve so as to see the loveliness of a life redeemed. It seems to me that it was for some such reason as this that our Lord declined to enter on any discussion with Nicodemus concerning this new religious movement, in which he showed a keen intellectual interest, saying in as many words: 'You do not see or feel or grasp the meaning and power and beauty of My message.' If Christ were here among us to-night, as in very truth He is, what would He ask? Do *we* feel the charm of a holy life, or see the loveliness of a meek and chastened spirit, or desire the humility that is pleased enough to be overlooked in a congregation which we have served for years? Are we pained by a story of sin, wounded by the sight of pride or greed in a good man, shocked by a cry for retaliation or by a sneer at a pure life? If these things are true of us, would He not say: 'Then verily, you are born again'?

Nicodemus was puzzled by this new view of his relation to God, and asked: 'How can a man be born when he is old? How can these things be?' That question does not seem to me a silly one. It would appear rather that the whole Christian world has, in one form or another, been trying to answer it ever since the night Christ spoke. And never have men highly skilled in mental science been so busy with the problem as they are to-day. It is quite true we cannot solve it, but we can at least try to understand it, if it be only a little. To be born again, as our Lord said that night, is to be born of the Spirit, and the Spirit of the living God is God dealing with us, thinking of us, seeking us, persuading us, working in us. On the other hand, our spirit is *our* power of thinking, of desiring and seeking, of being interested, of purposing and doing. When the Spirit of God speaks to us, He speaks in our spirits, that is to say, in our thoughts, in our affections, in our wills. When we make God's thoughts our thoughts, love Him as He loves us, surrender our wills to accomplish His will, then we have the new heart, we are born again. This new birth, this begetting us anew, is not something God does *to* us, but something He does *through* us—something He does by means of our own thinking and desiring and purposing and striving. He appeals to us in our human nature, He persuades us by revealing Himself, He wins us by His love for us—and all through Jesus Christ. It is Christ who saves us, not we who save ourselves. The preacher's duty and the teacher's is first and foremost to bring men into the presence of Christ, and to let Christ do His own special and gracious work of saving. It is not any word of ours that delivers men, but Christ; it is not any argument of ours that persuades men, but the Spirit of Christ, breathing like the wind upon the spirit of man. It is a mystery. Yet there is no mystery in this plain fact, that we can leave off our own petty efforts at salvation and our own narrow thoughts of God's mercy, and get out into the light of Christ, and breathe the fresh air of His redeeming love.

A friend of mine was called out one morning to visit a dying child. He had a mile or two to walk in the sunshine and the bracing air of a fine summer day. When he entered the ploughman's cottage, he found the tiny closet crowded with sympathetic neighbours, and the sobbing mother bending low over the dying infant. He felt stifled with the close air, and in his usual rapid manner, took in the situation and acted at once. Asking the women to withdraw and leave the kitchen door open, he lifted the mother from her child, saying: 'Stand back, you are choking your child.' He tried to open the little window, but finding it fixed, broke the glass with his stick. 'Stand back,' he quietly repeated to the mother, 'and let your child breathe the fresh air.' It very quickly revived. The child was actually choking for want of air, and

there were cubic miles of life-giving air on every side around it. This is a figure of what is happening in the spiritual world every day and in every Christian land. The great tide of the Father's universal, unwearying, inexhaustible love is beating upon us and surging around us every moment of our lives, and we shut our children up in the close stifling air of our own petty thoughts of Him, debate over little details of doctrine and church order, unchurch one another for not holding views which our Lord never mentioned. Thus our children have their spiritual instincts and aspirations checked and perverted within them. Stand back and let the love of their Heavenly Father flow freely into their hearts. Let them look into the face of Jesus Christ, and it will transform them into His image. Let them feel something of His compassion, and see what agonies He bore for their sakes. It is the presence of Christ, and the contemplation of His words and His sufferings, that create the new heart, and bring a man, even when he is old, to birth again.

There is another thought, one which may have been in your minds while I have been speaking. If it is in any sense a birth, you may say, how is it possible, now that our habits of thought and feeling have been formed? Let me conclude with a few words on this mysterious problem. There is, I believe, in every man a germ of the divine, which, if it is cared for, fed and nourished, will change him into a son of God. This germ of spiritual life is often buried deep under habits of sin, or under the cares and worries of business, or the inordinate love of knowledge, or the calls of social life, or the satisfactions of a happy home. Into such entanglements, the whole life may get so absorbed that there is no time left for God. Nevertheless the seed remains, and cannot entirely be destroyed so long as man is man, for it is a part of his rational nature. The grace of the Almighty has not been sleeping, for appeals have been made to this germ from day to day in books, and speech, in the lives of men and women, in the events that have been a man's lot, in sorrow or defeat or failure, in the coming of his children, or the approach of death. These have kept the life from perishing. Then at last on God's own day, Christ comes athwart the soul; He speaks, and the soul listens; He pleads, and the soul feels the power of the pleading; He persuades, and the soul yields itself; He reveals the love of the Father in the Cross, and the soul embraces Him. Then is seen what is surely the most marvellous of all miracles, the bands of sin and self are broken, and the man rises clean away from the thraldom of his old life, and becomes the bondslave of Christ for ever.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord.'—Ro 12^{11}.

A LIFE spent on a farm that is not too big can be very happy indeed, especially to boys and girls. I am thinking of a boy called George Williams who had his home at a delightful English farmstead. Such a jolly place it was. You would have loved the great open fireplace in the kitchen; both a pot and a kettle could hang over the fire at the same time, and there was room for a person to sit on a stool inside the fireplace. Then there was an old oak settle standing against the wall. If you sat on it and looked up you could see that the rafters were almost quite black, and you would feel that you did not wish them to be any other colour. The smoke from the fire painted them.

George was quite young—just fifteen—when he left that dear home to go to a town called Bridgewater to learn the drapery business. That was in the year 1836, so he must have been born in 1821.

It was a misty summer morning when he and his father set out for Bridgewater. Even although it was very early you may be sure his mother came down to the gate at the end of the garden which opened on to the public road and bade her boy an affectionate good-bye, and then stood watching the two figures in the dogcart until they were quite out of sight.

George was a ruddy-faced, active boy. Standing behind the shop counter he seemed born to the business. He loved it. He did more than merely sell things; he kept writing down, or committing to memory, particulars of prices and names of

customers. His pockets were always stuffed with papers.

His master knew that he had a good apprentice, and he was a favourite with the other lads. But you may be sure George's thoughts often turned to the old farm, and the dear mother who lived there.

There were twenty-seven assistants in the Bridgewater shop, and they all lived in, that is to say, there were rooms provided for them on the premises. They were supposed to go to the Congregational Church, but only George and one or two others went. He heard a message there that he never forgot. 'I first learned in Bridgewater to love my dear Lord and Saviour for what He had done for me,' he said long afterwards.

After some years he left Bridgewater to go to London. There he joined a church where he could get plenty of church work to do. There was a wonderful preacher in it, one who would not let anybody go to sleep. George loved to listen to him, and he set himself to try to get other young men to attend. He felt sure that hearing such preaching would give them something good to think about during the week and lead them on to be better men.

Every day but Sunday he was busy in the warehouse of a firm of wholesale and retail drapers, and from the time he went into it he climbed the ladder of success. His upward progress was made step by step. One of the buyers was seen cutting off a piece of silk and putting it into a drawer. His master found this out and dismissed him. George Williams got his place. But he did not become conceited; he pegged away, working in the interest of his master day after day and month after month, until through that little country lad's exertions the business became ever so much bigger.

There were a hundred and forty hands in the warehouse instead of twenty-seven as at Bridgewater. They too were boarded in the house. George Williams felt sorry for them. He knew that many of the lads were fresh from country homes like himself—homes where God was feared—and now they were drifting into the habit of never entering a church door. They spent their Sundays in a way that not only would have grieved their mothers, but was doing great harm to their own souls. George started a prayer-meeting. It met in a little upper room. At first only three came, but gradually the attendance increased until the little room was packed full of young men, all deeply in earnest. It must have been a wonderful sight.

That prayer-meeting was the beginning of the Young Men's Christian Association. Through George Williams' influence other business houses began to have their prayer-meetings; then an association was formed and given a name. During the war the name of the Y.M.C.A. was on every one's lips. Boys wrote home, telling what a blessing it was to them. They felt they had a sort of home in the huts, and at the meetings they sometimes got fitted with armour, and when they put it on they knew there was no need to fear even death.

To tell what George Williams did for the Y.M.C.A. would make a long story in itself. You are more concerned to know about the boy who left the farm one misty summer morning, without influence, without money, and became a great business man. He succeeded because he deserved success. He worked hard, and he loved his work. One thing he said in referring to his own success was that he believed that religious men who had natural ability, education, and a certain amount of general knowledge made the best men of business.

When the Y.M.C.A. had been in existence fifty years, there were Jubilee Celebrations, and at the same time George Williams was made a knight. When he read the letter telling him of Queen Victoria's pleasure, 'It is not for me,' he said, 'it is for the Association. It belongs to our Master; let us put it at His feet.' There and then he and his friends knelt in prayer, and humbly gave the glory to Him to whom it was due.

Boys and girls generally pity old people. 'Poor old man,' 'Poor old woman,' they say. They don't know how beautiful old age may be to those who watch it with understanding eyes. With Sir George Williams it was as if the glory of the old world overlapped into this. He loved children. When he was eighty-one, and visiting the seaside at Filey, he stood on the top of a sand-castle and addressed a crowd of little ones gathered round him. There was a photograph taken of that meeting, and it shows a little girl being lifted up to shake hands with him and doubtless to get his blessing. You would have liked to be in her place, would you not?

At the end, 'He did but dream of Heaven and he was there.' He was buried in St. Paul's

Cathedral, near which he had so long been in business. He had lived for the people, and in death the people claimed him.

The Shadow of a Cloud.

'The shadow of a cloud.'—Is 25^5.

You all know what a shadow is. It is the outline of a figure or form thrown on the ground or on some object. A shadow is made when something gets in the way of the light. When a cloud comes between us and the sun its shadow is thrown on the earth. When you get between a lamp and a wall your shadow is thrown on the wall. So you see that to form a shadow there must be two things—light and something that obscures or cuts off part of the light.

Now shadows are things that we are not very fond of as a rule. When the sun hides his face behind a cloud we feel dull and cold till he peeps out again. And so people have often compared troubles to shadows. It is of this kind of shadow I want to speak to-day.

There are two sorts of trouble shadows in the world. There are the shadows God sends, and there are the shadows we make.

1. First let us look at the shadows God sends. What are the names of some of them? Difficulties, disappointments, sorrows. Sometimes you hear people talking as if boys and girls had no troubles at all, as if their days were one long blaze of sunshine from morning to night. But I don't think that is the case. Boys and girls are perhaps able to forget their troubles sooner than the grown-ups, but I think that while the troubles are there, they are just as big to the boys and girls as the older people's troubles are to them, and just as hard to bear.

A great many people are puzzled to know why God sends us these shadows. 'If God loves us so much,' they say, 'why does He send us things that hurt us?' And they forget that it is just because God loves us so much that He does send us troubles. Some things grow best in the dark. If you want to grow a hyacinth in a pot, after you have planted it you must shut it up for some weeks in a dark cupboard. And God knows that some beautiful things would never grow in our lives if the clouds did not hide the sun. If we lived always in the sunshine we might become lazy and selfish, or proud and hard. But God sends the shadows to make us brave and strong, sympathetic and kind.

The big question for you and for me is—how are we to deal with those shadows that God sends? Some people fret and rebel against them; others persist in looking at nothing but the shadows, and so they get into deeper and deeper gloom. Both those ways are foolish. When we are in the shadow we must remember to make use of the shade to grow the beautiful things that won't flourish in the sunshine. And we must keep remembering that there can never be a shadow without light, and that somewhere on the other side of the shadow is sunshine. There is a verse which says:

> The inner side of every cloud
> Is bright and shining;
> I therefore turn my clouds about
> And wear them always inside out
> To show the lining.

On the other side of the cloud that looks so dark the sun is shining. Don't forget the bright side of the cloud.

2. But what of the shadows we make? Well, you know everybody carries a shadow about with them. They can't help it. Wherever you go, your shadow goes too. And so I think that wherever we go we shall always find little troubles and annoyances.

But there are two things we can do with these shadows.

First we can see that they are not exaggerated. You know that when the sun is low or we are a long way off from a street lamp our shadows grow to an extraordinary size—quite out of proportion to ourselves. Our legs look yards long and our body is drawn out like a telescope.

There is a mountain in Germany called the Brocken. It is nearly a mile high, and at sunset a great wall of mist hangs over it. If you went up there towards sunset and stood at a certain spot on the top you might see what looked like the shadow of a huge giant thrown on the clouds. And then you would notice that when you moved the giant moved, and you would discover that the likeness of the giant was nothing but your own shadow very much exaggerated. So don't exaggerate your small worries. Don't make them ten times bigger than they are. That is the first way to deal with the shadows we carry about.

And the second way is—keep your face towards the sun. If you do that, do you know what will happen? Your shadow will be behind you, and that is where it ought to be. Don't keep walking in your own shadow, and looking at your own shadow. Don't brood over your troubles. How can you help feeling sad and gloomy if you do?

The sun's in a cloud,
The morning is dreary,
The way is too long,
The feet are too weary,
The friend is not kind,
And smiles are not shining,
The roses and robins
Are paling and pining.
That hour is the saddest
From May day to Yule
When little Dolores
Is going to school.
What is the reason? She turns from the light,
And walks in her shadow from morning till night.

The sun is the brightest,
The morn is the clearest,
The burden is lightest,
The friend is the dearest,
The flowers are all waking,
The way is not long;
The birds are all breaking
At once into song.
That hour is the gladdest
From May day to Yule,
When little Allegra
Is going to school.
What is the secret? Wherever you find her,
The shadow of little Allegra's behind her.[1]

There is just one thing more I should like you to remember. Don't make shadows for other people. Never stand in anybody else's light and shut off the sunshine from them. I have known people who were like cold, damp shadows whenever they entered a house, and all because their tempers were black and horrid. Don't be shadows to other people; don't make the world darker or colder for anybody. Aim rather at being sunbeams, and then you will cheer and bless wherever you go.

Three Great Trees.

'A great tree.'—Lk 13[19] (A.V.).

'A great tree.'—That is our text this morning. I am just sorry it is not '*three* great trees,' for I am going to tell you this morning of three great trees, each of which is great in more ways than one.

The trees of which I am going to speak are alive at this moment, so far as I know. They are all to be found in the north-east corner of Scotland, and they are growing not so very far apart. You could see them all in one day if you had a cycle, for the first and the second are growing within a mile or two of each other, and the third is distant only about thirty miles from the first.

1. The first great tree grows at the edge of a wood close to the road. You can hardly fail to notice it as you walk past. If your eyes are sharp you will look twice at it, and then you will exclaim, 'How very queer!' No wonder! This extraordinary tree is not one tree, but two trees in one. About a foot from the ground the trunk, which is that of a beech, divides in two. One-half goes on growing as a beech, but the other turns into an ash. You can pick out its stem at once in contrast with that of the beech, and if you look up you will see far overhead branches of ash leaves and branches of beech leaves mingling in the friendliest fashion. How did these trees come to be one? Who can tell? They are old trees now, and they have been sharing the same roots for many and many a year. There is no quarrelling who shall have the most sap, or who shall get the greatest amount of sunshine. They have shared and shared alike all their lives, and that is why people stop to admire them to-day.

I wish we were all as ready as that tree to share our good things. I am afraid some of us are more like the little girl who had a sister a year older than herself. Whatever the older sister got the younger insisted on having also. Her favourite words were, 'Me too!' One day the older girl was ill and the doctor ordered her medicine with a particularly horrid taste. Little sister saw the bottle, and she saw mother measuring out a spoonful into a glass for the invalid. As usual she cried, 'Me too!' And mother thought it would be a good lesson for little sister, and she knew the medicine would do her no harm, so she gave 'Me too' an overflowing spoonful. After that 'Me too' was less heard in the nursery.

Now which do you admire most—the twin trees or little 'Me too'? I know which I admire, and which I wish you to copy.

[1] M. A. Lathbury.

2. The second tree is a lime tree. It is growing in the grounds of a famous castle, and it is almost as famous as the castle itself. It is carefully preserved and has a railing round it, and the Duke who owns it is tremendously proud of it. Well he may be! How big do you think it is? Well, you may not believe me when I tell you, but it covers half an acre of ground. It is so huge that they say 1000 men can stand under its shade. How did it manage to grow so great? I can tell you in three words—by being humble. When it spread its long branches it did not lift them haughtily to heaven, it bent them meekly towards the earth. And these branches as they swept the ground took root and sprang up again around their parent tree, so that besides the great main stem there are countless smaller stems steadying and supporting and feeding that great tree. Like all truly great people that splendid lime is humble. You see, you never can be truly great unless you are first truly humble.

They tell a tale of a certain royal princess who is living to-day. When she was a young girl she was crossing a gangway from a ship to the quay, and her foot slipped. She would have fallen but a sailor on the ship put out a hand and steadied her saying, 'Take care, Miss!' The princess, I suppose, was rather cross about having tripped, and she turned round and said sharply, 'Don't call me "Miss"! Remember I am a *Princess*.' The sailor looked rather abashed, but the Queen, who was walking behind her daughter, had heard the rebuke. She turned to the sailor and said graciously, 'Thank you very much indeed for your kindness. My daughter, as she says, is a princess; but we hope some day she will be a *lady*.' That wise Queen knew that to be proud was to be merely small, and to be humble was to be really great. Boys and girls, which do you admire most—the giant tree or the silly princess?

3. The third tree is an oak. To my mind it is the greatest of the three great trees, although you may not agree with me at the first glance. It grows, like the first tree, near the highroad. But, alas! it does not stand up straight and tall. A winter's gale has blown it over, and it lies on its side with three-quarters of its roots sticking up in the air. Its leafy top too has been sawn away, for it fell across the road, and so it has only about twenty feet of trunk left. Do you think it has given up and ceased to grow because it has lost all its head and most of its roots? Not a bit of it! It is as busy as ever sending out branches and leaves on the piece of trunk which remains.

And so I think that tree is the greatest of the three trees because it is so brave and plucky. You would have quite excused it if, when the wind knocked it over and the saw beheaded it, it had said, 'It's no use growing any more. I'm done. All I can do now is to die.' But that oak was no ordinary oak. It had plenty pluck, and with its six remaining roots it set to work to make itself over again.

Boys and girls, I want you to imitate that oak. Never acknowledge you are beaten. Stick in! What are difficulties and obstacles? They are just chances to show your mettle. Keep smiling, and keep going on when it would be easier to sit down and weep. Though you should lose everything else in the world, *never lose heart*. That's pluck. And it is pluck that wins in life. You admire it, I admire it, every one admires it. And, let me tell you a secret, God admires it most of all.

The Christian Year.

Tenth Sunday after Trinity.

Christianity is Christ.

'To me to live is Christ.'—Ph 1^{21}.

The distinctive fact in Christianity is Christ. Three points deserve prominence.

1. The personality of Jesus Christ belongs to history, not myth. When we ask the precise reason why Christianity prevailed as a world-religion, whereas the hero-cults of antiquity have so utterly perished that to-day they have no votaries at all, the answer to a great extent lies in the circumstance that Dionysus, Herakles, Attis, and the like were purely legendary figures impossible to localize in any situation known to have been historically real, but Jesus Christ lived and died. His rivals failed to appear within the lists of time. No witnesses came forward testifying that they had associated with Serapis or Isis in life's common ways, had listened to their words, or made acquaintance with their character and found that their life answered consistently to their doctrine. Jesus, on the contrary, was presented in the personal testimony of those who had known

Him. 'That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you.' Built thus on the actual, His Gospel could outlast the storms of speculation. The soil of fact, to which its roots went down, afforded stability and growth and ever-renewed vigour.

It has occasionally been complained that the Jesus of the Apostles' Creed might, except for a trifling historical reference like the mention of Pontius Pilate, be quite well identified or at least co-ordinated with any of the contemporary nature-deities, say the Babylonian Tammuz. But even in the Apostles' Creed, in spite of its not over-successful attempts to identify Jesus in a fashion satisfactory to the Christian mind, the strongest emphasis is laid on history; and in the New Testament, especially the Gospels, the first interest of every writer is beyond dispute in facts. A deep gulf therefore separates Jesus from mythic sun-gods or deities of vegetation, whose alleged experiences are but imaginative transcripts of natural processes interpreted as the fortunes or adventures of gods and goddesses who, like leaves or grass, die in winter to revive again in spring. This is to say nothing of the rude, foul, or unintelligible elements which these mythic stories may contain.

2. The History of Religions contains no parallel to the self-consciousness of Jesus. Unless we toss the Gospels overboard, it is certain that our Lord's attitude to God, to men, and to His own significance for the world is an unprecedented attitude. What we know of Buddha or Mohammed, to take the chief examples, shows nothing in the least analogous to His sense of Divine sonship, His experience of God's love, His perfect fulfilment of vocation. Unquestionably Jesus seems to conceive of salvation as dependent on Himself; He seems to call men less to His teaching than to His own person as the embodiment and guarantee of the truth He proclaims; He seems implicitly to take God's place in relation to the soul, and to make personal devoted love to Him the equivalent of faith in the redemptive sense of the word. He seems to do all these things, and there is no reason to doubt that actually He did them.

But nothing in the least resembling this is characteristic of the method pursued by the great religious teachers. No other religious leader can be named who displays a tendency to identify with himself the truth proclaimed by him, or to claim that in him revelation is so focused and concentrated as to be charged with power to save. In the case of Jesus, however, His conscious sonship is felt by Him to be the supreme reality; and in the light of it He recognized clearly the work God had laid upon Him. It was not that He knew Himself as Messiah, and from this rose to the certainty that God was His Father; the connexion of the two facts is just the opposite. He is Son of Man, visible Head of the Kingdom of God, in virtue of the still deeper consciousness that He is Son of God. The roots of His vocation lie in the uniqueness of His relation to the Father. But eventually we cannot separate these two aspects. The higher in the scale of being a human character may stand, the more completely vocation and personality coincide, and in the case of Jesus the coincidence was absolute. 'It is, in fact, the *differentia* of Christianity as a religion,' writes Denney, 'that the distinction which can sometimes be drawn between a person and the cause for which he stands is in it no longer valid.'

3. In Christ there is given the personal presence of God, in redeeming power. The term 'incarnation,' which to certain minds has recently become suspect, will no doubt recover its place in due course, since it represents an idea with which the religious mind, at its highest, cannot dispense. We may use it here without concern to indicate the fact that in Jesus Christ, who lived a man's life, we confront the redemptive agency of God in a degree that transcends all we could ask or think. Nor is incarnation only a metaphor. As Canon Streeter has observed, 'if the essential, distinctive, and most fundamental quality of the Spirit we call God is love, this is a quality which can be exhibited directly and undisguisedly and without any admixture of symbolism and metaphor in a perfect human life and character.' Christian faith is built upon the conviction that in Jesus' life, death, and triumph the pathway between the Father and His human children has been opened up, and opened from God's side. We claim for the Gospel, as a vital and unique element, this perfectly moralized thought of mediation through incarnate love. Jesus meets a world of sin not as the supreme prophet merely, but as One fully aware that in the relationship of God and man everything turns upon Himself.

Incarnation doubtless is an idea as old, or very nearly as old, as religion itself. That gods, moved by desires selfish or beneficent, could temporarily assume human form, was

widely believed. In Scandinavian, Greek, and Indian mythology this thought frequently recurs; but it really affords no analogy to the Christian message, if for no other reason than for this, that the presupposed idea of God is so imperfectly ethical that Deity can with equal facility unite itself to either human or animal nature. In Hinduism, for example, the thought of incarnation is specially associated with the god Vishnu, who during the series of his numerous *avataras* may assume the guise of fish or tortoise. If it be replied that he is completely manifested in Krishna, constituting in this form a full satisfaction and epitome of the cravings and experiences of the Hindu soul, we must yet consider that all this stands in no positive relation to historic fact. What the mythology does bear witness to is the need of a personal Redeemer operating within human life, and through it revealing God; precisely this actuality is lacking. Krishna, as a self, is no part of the historical record, and in the vague fantastic outlines of the picture it is impossible for us to envisage any authentic character, deeply based in credible experience. To gain the world, the truth of God as He is must embody itself in a tale of morally verifiable meaning, with for hero a self-accrediting personality.[1]

Eleventh Sunday after Trinity.

The Atonement.

'Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.'—1 P 2^{24}.

When we read the Scripture aright, we see that atonement has its spring and energy within the Divine, holy Love itself. When, accordingly, that Love loads itself with the sin of man, and carries it in unknown anguish, atonement has been made, salvation has been won, God has reconciled the world to Himself. The whole meaning of the atonement, and all its issues and consequences, are far beyond the experience even of the ripest faith, or of the whole community of the redeemed. God alone can comprehend in its fulness what God alone has wrought. Nevertheless, enlightened by the experience of salvation, through that atoning deed, we may grasp certain aspects of its wonder and its truth.

(1) In the first place, if God bear the sin of men, then the nature of sin has been exposed with a completeness which no doctrinal statement could attain. It is an offence against the infinite Love. What sinners assail is not impersonal Law, but the living God Himself. The blow is struck at His heart, and it gets home.

(2) In the second place, if God bear the sin of men, the judgment, which is sin's inevitable consequence, has been laid upon His heart and has been lifted away for ever. The guilt of sin committed, as it is, against the living and holy God, cannot be borne by the sinner himself. Not the sinner's utmost woe, not even the punishment of all the guilty souls that ever were, could be the equivalent of that judgment which sin deserves, and must receive, if the moral universe is to remain unshaken in the estimate of a holy God, and in that of an enlightened human conscience. Love, no less than Holiness, requires that sin shall be judged if men are to be redeemed. Love alone can bear that judgment which itself demands. When Love carries in its heart the guilt and shame of the world, sin is judged, and the holiness of God is vindicated.

(3) In the third place, if God bear the sin of men, sacrificial Love has been proved victorious. In the world where man's self-assertion and selfishness sought and claimed the victory, they have been defeated, once for all. Love has triumphed in the very act in which it laid upon itself the need of men, and bore it through nameless experience of Divine sorrow. In the centre of the moral universe, enthroned above all cosmic powers and principles, is seated vicarious suffering Love.

To begin to discern these things, to apprehend, even in some measure, our need as sinners, sin's exceeding sinfulness, the awfulness of its judgment, and the deathless energy of sacrificial Love, is the beginning of our salvation. To enter ever more deeply into them, to repent with growing grief and hatred of sin, to cast ourselves in our guilt and helplessness more and more upon the everlasting mercy, to open our very souls to the constraint of dying Love, and to live ever more simply and fully as its subjects, its witnesses and its vehicles—*this* is to become, in ever-enlarging measure, partakers of the great salvation.[2]

Twelfth Sunday after Trinity.

The Living Christ in Ephesians.

'The Lord Jesus Christ.'—Eph 1^{1}.

It is with Jesus as the Christ that St. Paul deals in this Epistle, rather than with Jesus as the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. That St. Paul's language about the Christ presupposes His Divinity may be entirely true. As has been often pointed

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, *The Originality of the Christian Message.*

[2] T. B. Kilpatrick, *The Redemption of Man.*

out, such language as that of the opening sentence —'Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ'—seems itself to presuppose it. If the Messiahship of Jesus is sufficient to account for such language, Messiahship must involve far more than the Hebrews were accustomed to believe. Moreover, St. Paul certainly believed that our Lord was One who, though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, and that He was in the form of God before He took upon Himself the form of a servant. But the full and formulated doctrine of the Person of Christ belongs to a time far later than St. Paul's, and we should not anticipate it in interpreting his words.

What is it then that, as Christ, Jesus has done and does for us? We will begin with the facts of His earthly life.

1. Now it is not St. Paul's way to dwell in detail upon the facts of our Lord's earthly life. It was the Lord living and glorified who had revealed Himself to St. Paul, and with whom St. Paul was chiefly concerned. There is perhaps no Epistle of which this is more true than it is of the Epistle to the Ephesians. But we may easily exaggerate St. Paul's want of interest in our Lord's earthly life; there are instances even in this Epistle where the thought of our Lord's earthly life may lie behind his words, and they are of some interest.

Look first at the passage of the Epistle where St. Paul first turns directly to the position of the Gentiles (2^{17-22}). Note first the words in which he says that our Lord came and preached peace to those that were far off and peace to those that were nigh. Is it quite clear that, as Dr. Robinson urges, in these words, 'We have a reference, not to the work of the Lord Jesus on earth before the crucifixion, but to the work of the exalted Christ in announcing the peace which His death had made'? No doubt it may be so: though the language in this case seems somewhat strange, the strangeness may be explained by the fact that St. Paul is adopting Old Testament words; and the preaching of the Apostles in the power of the Spirit of Christ may be rightly described as the coming and the preaching of the Lord Himself. But the action of the Lord certainly forms one great whole. The Gospels, as St. Luke says, tell us what 'Jesus began both to do and to teach' (Ac 1^{1}), and the Acts what He further did after His Ascension; and St. Paul's language may cover both parts of His activity. St. Paul was surely aware that the Lord in His earthly life did preach peace to those who were afar off as well as those that were nigh. In the first place, He appealed to the outcasts, who, like the Gentiles, were alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and whose spiritual position He practically identified with that of the heathen (Mt 18^{17}). In the second place, notably in His sermon at Nazareth, our Lord clearly seems to anticipate the inclusion of the Gentiles within the body to which the blessings of the kingdom belong, provided that they exercise that faith which the people of Nazareth are refusing. Both the widow of Zarephath and Naaman the Syrian are examples of people who receive supernatural blessing through their faith in the promises of God made by His servants. In the teaching of the Lord, as in the teaching of St. Paul himself, it is faith, and not obedience to the words of the law, which enables men to receive the blessings of the kingdom.

2. Secondly, we should observe the words in which St. Paul says that the Gentiles are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner-stone. We are, of course, at once reminded of the Lord's own words as to the foundation upon which He will build His Church, and of His reference to Himself as the corner-stone. This reference follows immediately upon the parable of the wicked husbandmen, who murdered the son and heir of the Lord of the vineyard, the parable which concludes with the words, 'What therefore will the Lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen and will give the vineyard unto others.' We see again how close is the connexion between St. Paul's teaching and that of the Lord. St. Paul's doctrine of the universal headship intended for Christ is one with our Lord's teaching that He is the 'Heir.' Moreover, the very reason why the Church must be rebuilt is that it is faith in Jesus as the Christ which is the essential thing, and not obedience to the Mosaic Law; and from this it follows that Gentiles may be members of the Church as well as Jews.

3. Thirdly, we should observe the words in which St. Paul says that 'our Lord made Gentiles and Jews to be one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained

in ordinances' (2[14. 15]). We need not at this point consider the rather difficult thoughts as to the relation of Christ's death to the law, which appear in other Epistles, and may here also be in St. Paul's mind. Two things at any rate are clear. In the first place, the separation of Jews from Gentiles did centre round the law. Though the Church was open to all even before the Lord came, the necessity for those who would join it of obedience to the law formed for the vast majority of Gentiles an obstacle practically insuperable. In the second place, it was our Lord who took this barrier away. Not only did His teaching 'make all meats clean' (Mk 7[19]); its whole trend, like that of the prophetic teaching, was to discount the importance of all that was not really included in the dictates of holiness and love. Finally, by opening a new way to the Father, He rendered the old means of approach no longer necessary. As St. Paul says, He reconciled them both in one body unto God through the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby. At the Conference of Jerusalem it was precisely this consideration of the new way made to the Father, to which St. Peter referred as rendering it no longer reasonable to insist upon the observance of the law. 'God,' he says, 'made no distinction between Gentiles and Jews,' cleansing their hearts by faith. 'Now, therefore, why tempt ye God, that ye should put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they.' Those are the abiding refutations of legalism, ready for it whenever it lifts its head. Let the legalist say what he will about the obligatory character of the things upon which he lays such stress, God, in the bestowal of His spiritual blessings, makes no distinction between those who observe them and those who do not. Moreover, the legalist himself does not really trust them. He looks to be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, as others do.[1]

Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Fulness of Life.

'I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly.'—Jn 10[10].

When the Son of God took our human nature upon Him, He entered into the whole of our human life, and made all human experience His own—except sin, which is not truly human. He came that men might have life, and might have it abundantly; and while His chief purpose was to restore that highest form of life which is fellowship with God, He cared intensely for the soundness and sacredness of those human relationships which are an essential part of the life of men. His victory was won in the spiritual sphere, but that victory embraces body, soul, and spirit, and the things which men call secular share in its fruits. Therefore the whole Church was a great brotherhood, and its sacraments told of fellowship among men, as well as of fellowship between man and God. The old barriers were broken down, for all humanity is summed up in Jesus Christ. 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female. Ye are all one man in Christ Jesus.' Race, class, sex do not count: Christ is all and in all.

How, then, can we set about our duty, and what steps can we take to follow the example of the Church in its best days?

1. We must claim for the Christian law the ultimate authority to rule social practice. Truism as this seems to us, there is an immense number of Christian people who either disregard the claim or offer mere lip service to it. Our first business is to convert the Church to a true idea of what conversion means. It is perfectly true that conversion is the primary work of the Church; but even now it is commonly supposed that conversion begins and ends with the interests of a man's own soul, and that the goal to which a man is turned is an enlightened self-interest—viz. his soul's eternal welfare. The point to be made clear is that Christian conversion means a turning from self to Christ: it is the acceptance of our Lord as the Saviour who saves us from selfishness, and as the King who demands our whole-hearted allegiance. If He is to be King anywhere, He must be King everywhere. We cannot possibly exclude our politics, our social relationships, or our industry, from His sovereignty. We must at least try to apply His principles at every point.

2. We must therefore make up our minds what are the Christian principles which rule social practice. On most of those principles we are agreed. A brief statement of them may be found in the report of the Committee on Christianity

[1] H. L. Goudge, *Three Lectures on the Epistle to the Ephesians*.

and Industry appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York.

(1) The Gospels draw a clear distinction between life and the means of living. Avarice, the inordinate desire for gain, is regarded as a sin not less grave than some others which are to-day more generally condemned. There is an austere and reiterated warning against undue preoccupation with what we should call 'economic considerations.' Wealth is a responsibility for its owners, not a luxury to be used as they please.

(2) Every human personality is of infinite and equal value, because all are children of the one Father. Therefore it is wrong to use any human being for less than a human purpose. So far as an industrial system treats men or women as mere instruments of production, that system stands condemned.

(3) This emphasis on the value of individuality is balanced by the emphasis on the fact that Christians are members of a society. As we are brethren, the principle of working together for the common good is clearly more Christian than the principle of competing one against another for private profit. According to the doctrine of the New Testament, work is a duty laid upon all; the members of a Christian community should aim at giving rather than getting, and they should seek the service of others rather than the personal profit of themselves. 'The doctrine sometimes advanced that a man is free to do what he likes with his own, that all men are justified in following their own pecuniary interests to the fullest extent allowed by law, and that social well-being will incidentally but certainly result from their efforts to further their own self-interest, is definitely anti-Christian.'

(4) The New Testament emphasizes the duty of the society to its members. 'The social order must be tested by the degree in which it secures for each freedom for happy, useful, and untrammelled life, and distributes, as widely and equitably as may be, social advantages and opportunities.' Quite clearly there are problems with regard to infant life, to housing, to the payment of an adequate wage, to unemployment, etc., the responsibility for which lies upon the whole community, and no member of the community can absolve himself from the duty of at least helping to solve them.

3. Even with regard to these principles, about which all Christian people must surely be agreed, the Church needs to give a better witness than it has given in the past. If it were alive to its duty 'it would point out to its members that if they are living idly, whether on charity or on inherited wealth, when they are able to work, they are committing a sin; that luxury and waste in any class of society are not only correspondent to, but largely responsible for, the want and destitution which are a blot on that society, and that this connection of cause and effect needs to be clearly indicated to those concerned. When it saw men making large fortunes out of public necessities it would remonstrate with them. When it saw one class taking advantage of another and more helpless class, it would point out that this was wrong. Nor would the Church confine itself to warnings of a negative character. It would emphasize the duty of strenuous and honest work, the obligation of all men to observe a high standard of honour, of public spirit, and of humanity in their economic transactions, and their moral responsibility for the organisation of industry and for the standard of social life obtaining in the society of which they are members. Above all, it would seek to impress upon them the conviction that industry is a social function carried on for the benefit of the whole community, and would teach them to seek satisfaction, not in evading their share of the common task, but in discharging it more faithfully.'[1]

Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Courage!

'Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee.'—Mt 9^2.

Three times the phrase 'Be of good cheer' is used in the Gospels by Jesus. The literal translation would be 'Courage.' It is the call from despair to hope. It is the incentive to heroism. It is the inspiration to a new awakening.

You will find the passages in Mt 9^2, 'Courage, my son; your sins are forgiven you'; Mt 14^{29}, 'Courage; it is I, have no fear'; and Jn 16^{33}, 'Courage, I have conquered the world.' They are thus spoken to the sinner, to the frightened and wearied, and to the afflicted and persecuted worker. It is the gospel of good cheer as preached by the Founder of the Christian faith.

The classical use of the term in Aristotle and

[1] J. A. Kempthorne, in *Some Christian Essentials of Reconstruction.*

Plutarch means 'Collect yourself; have your wits about you; be ready for action.' That is a warning. Christ's use of the term was an inspiration. The inspiration includes the warning. I would rather have the inspiration with the warning than the warning without the inspiration. That is why Jesus is better than Aristotle. Jesus always inspires, because He is the only teacher in the world who is able to look into the future with hopefulness. And without hope the world falls into a dismal despondency.

1. Christ's first use of the word was to an individual. 'Be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee.' But for sin the earth would be like heaven. Every age has had its saviour and its panacea. In every case except one the saviour and the panacea have been spelt with a small letter. There has only been one Saviour. Another will never be needed. Christ is the only One who has been able effectively to say—and He waits to say it to you—'Thy sins be forgiven thee.'

Be of good cheer, then, my brother, it is possible for you to rise above your weakness, your passion, your sins. Christ can impart unto you the power to rise above your circumstances, to master yourself, and to transform your troubles into blessings, and to be glad. That is why the Gospel is called 'Glad tidings.' Christ's message to every individual is of forgiveness.

2. The second use of the term is to a select company of men—the disciples, troubled, tired, frightened, as they were pulling their small craft across the boisterous lake in the midnight darkness. But 'He saw them toiling in rowing.' He knew every stroke of the oars, saw every swelling of their muscles, beheld every sweat-drop fall from their perspiring heads. He saw and heeded, though they thought He did not. At the moment when they were about to give up in despair He called out to them, as He also appeared by their side, 'Courage; it is I, be not afraid.'

And there is the promise of the perpetual companionship of the Saviour with those who are doing His will; for those men were in the path of duty; it was for Him they were rowing; they could have turned about and gone with the wind homeward; but they toiled on, and in toiling they 'had the vision splendid.'

Beware, however, of the kind of courage which Peter exhibited when he attempted to walk on the water and sank. Courage is fearlessness and fearlessness with consecrated intelligence is faith. The faith which the presence of Christ always brings is that which 'laughs at impossibilities, and cries it shall be done.'

3. The third use of the term was to a company which represented the human race. 'Courage; I have conquered the world.' That was a daring assertion to make. It was either blasphemy or audacious faith. We know now that it was the audacity of faith. The audacity is seen in that it was made on the very eve of His crucifixion, which in the eyes of the world was the indication of His failure. But with the full knowledge of what Calvary meant He actually in sight of it declared the ultimate success of His mission as if it were an actual realized fact. 'I have overcome.' 'I have conquered the world.' The purpose of it was that as they would be exposed to trials after His departure they should ever remember His exhortation to steadfastness and ever believe in the sure success of their cause.

There you are, then, brothers—dare to be, do, suffer, die, if needs be, but never lose your faith. Meet your trials with gladness, and your tribulation with cheerfulness, and you, too, will be a conqueror who will put Alexander and Caesar and Napoleon to shame. You have already put the Kaiser to shame. 'This is the victory which overcometh the world, even your faith.'

Now, as conquerors wear the jubilant garb, carry the cheerful countenance, show the exultant spirit, and shame the world's levity. So, by the sacred fulness of your joy, 'Be of good cheer, courage.'[1]

[1] Fred A. Rees, *Honour and Heroism.*

Our Lord's Cry on the Cross.

(MARK xv. 34 AND MATT. xxvii. 46.)

By William E. Wilson, B.D., Woodbrooke, Birmingham,
and the Reverend J. A. Smallbone, Southport.

Why was there wrung from Jesus Christ on the Cross a cry of desolation? Theologians used to answer, because He was facing separation from God, and because He was bearing the penalty of the sins of men.

There are increasingly few Christians who can subscribe to either of these statements. The objections to the latter have been frequently stated and are widely felt. It is not, then, necessary to state them here. As to the former statement, all support of it goes if the truth of the latter be denied. For if Christ was not suffering the divine penalty of sin, there would seem to be no adequate ground for supposing that God even temporarily forsook Him. Indeed, if—as we must—we trace the Atonement to the patient love of God, and see in the Cross the manifestation in time of the suffering of God for man till all are redeemed, then it is evident that at no time can God have been so thoroughly united with Jesus as when the final agony of the Cross took place. And this corresponds with Paul's great words, 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself' (2 Co 5^{19}). This could scarcely be true if at the crucial point of that reconciling work God forsook Christ.

The ordinary explanation of those who deny that God really forsook Christ is that the cry was not a cry of despair and hopelessness, that it was rather an expression of trust in God *in spite of* apparent hopelessness. This is supported by the suggestion that the whole of the 22nd Psalm was on our Lord's mind and was implicitly contained in the first words of it quoted. It may be too much to say that this is an impossible explanation, but it is a little far-fetched.

Nor is the suggestion that the cry was wrung from Jesus as the result of the accumulation of agony and sense of the hatred of men quite satisfactory. Because that would ascribe to Him weakness of a type to which many a Christian martyr has been superior. Nothing is more striking in the history of martyrs than the frequency with which, in the midst of enmity as great and sufferings of a bodily sort perhaps even greater than those of our Lord, they have been filled with joy, and died with songs of rejoicing. This in its turn is a most remarkable phenomenon and requires explanation. It is from the hypothesis propounded to explain the martyr's joy and unconsciousness of pain, that we may get the key to the problem of our Lord's agony and cry of desertion.

As Dr. Workman says: 'When the great day came, and they passed into the furnace, lo! there was One standing beside them, like unto the Son of Man, and so "they found the fire of their inhuman torturers cold."'[1] That is the statement from the side of religious experience of a nowadays well-known psychological fact, sometimes called 'Obsession.' An idea can so dominate the whole consciousness of a person, that no other thought or sensation is perceived. To the martyr the sense of the presence of Christ was so keen that no other thought could enter his consciousness and the agony of his tortures was unfelt. It was to this fact that his extraordinary fortitude and joy were due. Dr. Workman also suggests that Jesus Christ was alone without such an experience. 'We believe it can be shown that Christ alone really suffered all the horror of His martyrdom—

> "'Yea, once Immanuel's orphaned cry His universe hath shaken,
> It went up single, echoless, "My God, I am forsaken."'

Thus Christ alone *tasted* death, drained the cup of its bitters to the dregs' (*op. cit.* p. 303).

This way of stating it seems to imply the theory that God had really forsaken Christ, the difficulties of which have already been indicated. Nor can it be that God withheld from His Son, when He was supremely doing His will, an experience which He readily granted to an ordinary martyr. There is no satisfactory way but to take a natural explanation for both experiences. Both, that is, must be explained by the state of mind of the subject rather than by some outside intervention. For we must believe that God does not arbitrarily give an experi-

[1] *Persecution in the Early Church*, p. 304.

ence of His presence to one and withhold it from another. The difference must be in the recipient. If, then, we have accounts of two martyrs, one of whom was rapt away from all feeling of his torments and knew only the love of God in Christ, while the other manfully bore them, not unconscious of communion with God and supported by it, but still terribly aware of his own agony, we shall attribute the difference in experience not to diverse measures of divine favour, but to the diverse mental and spiritual factors in the two cases; or to something in the circumstances of the latter that prevented him having the divine obsession.

It appears to be on this line that we may explain the forsaken cry of our Lord. Had His mind been free, it would undoubtedly have been filled with the experience of His Father's presence, just as the mind of the martyr often was. But it was not free. We have no need to ascribe to Jesus the nervous shrinking from pain and the fear of what was coming next, which may in some cases have prevented the martyr having the beatific vision in all its intensity. For this implies a self-regarding impulse which we ought not to attribute to Him who was supremely unselfish. But there is surely one line of thought that we have every reason to suppose was present with Him: the thought of man's sin and separation from the divine harmony, which was manifesting itself in rejecting and slaying God's Ambassador of Peace. This cannot have been absent from our Lord's mind. The writer to the Hebrews speaks with wonderful insight of Jesus enduring the *contradiction of sinners against themselves*.[1] It was that which filled His mind. The realization that He had used all His powers during His ministry to bring men to see the Father and to take the true way of life, and that they, even the best, did not rise to it; that the most religious were convinced they knew better; that all forsook Him, and most joined in condemning Him, because they could not, or would not, see God in Him. This realization finaliy filled the whole field of His consciousness, so that for one moment (it may have been no longer) that consciousness of communion with God, which He had never been without, was interrupted, and He felt Himself desolate. Jesus Christ on the Cross suffered from the obsession of the sin of man, and hence came His momentary cry of despair. But this does not mean that our sin was in any way transferred to Him. Such a thing is impossible. Sin is opposition to God. Jesus never opposed God. The obsession was due to sympathy for man—a sympathy which realized how the will of the Father was the good of men, which they in their sin and folly opposed, thinking it meant them evil. The poignant anguish of a world 'separated from the divine harmony' occupied the whole field of our Lord's consciousness, so that for the moment God was shut out. In His purity and complete union with God He felt by sympathy the tragedy of man's sin as no other man ever felt it.

This explanation is satisfactory as others are not. It does not admit a real separation between Christ and God. The sense of desolation is a phenomenon purely of our Lord's supraliminal consciousness (to use the jargon of the psychologist). But being that it is not the product of moral or reprehensible weakness, as might be the case if it were the product of a self-regarding fear of pain whether physical or mental. It is entirely due to a supremely unselfish concentration in sympathy on the sad plight of men. It is therefore the experience of one who was one with the God of Love—and never more closely one than at that moment.

[1] He 12^{3}, R.V. reading, following Westcott and Hort and the best MSS.

Contributions and Comments.

Paul's Buffeting of his Body.

There is a tendency among the commentators on 1 Co $9^{26.27}$ to deflect it from the official to a more personal application than Paul had in mind. Thus, for example, Hans Windisch (*Taufe und Sünde*, p. 136) wishes us to see in these verses an intimation that Paul required to keep under his bodily passions—or, as Windisch expresses it, 'the temptations to sin which arise from the body'—lest he should be led by them into sin. Accordingly he generalizes from them: 'In the body of

the Christian there moves a sinful power, according to this confession, which the Christian distinguishes from his ego, and which he seeks, with all the energy which his ego can exert, to prevent from coming into action.'

Windisch is much nearer right in an earlier remark to the effect that 'this self-characterization stands in relation to Paul's calling as a teacher'; although he applies this remark wrongly. The Apostle appears, in point of fact, merely to be alluding in these words to the hardships to which he voluntarily subjected himself in preaching to the Corinthians. Others ate and drank and married; he not only denied himself these common rights of man, but laboured without charge, not even taking the gleanings by the way secured by the law to the very labouring oxen, and bringing himself into nothing less than bondage to all. It was thus that he buffeted his body, not that he might overcome its evil impulses, but that by its bondage he might the better prosecute his labours. It was not that he feared his body's passions, but that he was consumed by zeal for the work of the gospel. When he says, 'Lest I myself should be rejected,' he but repeats his 'Woe is me, if I preach not the gospel.' We learn nothing, therefore, from this passage of the Apostle's consciousness of sin, or of 'the psychology of the sinless man.' What we learn is the strenuousness of the Apostle's labour in the gospel, and his subordination of the comforts, and even the necessities, of personal life to its prosecution.

Windisch is quite right in rejecting the remark of Max Meyer (*Der Apostel Paulus*, p. 26), to the effect that the passage shows us the great rôle which 'sin' played in the life of the Apostle, as well as the more generalized one of A. Titius (*Seligkeit*, iii. p. 81), to the effect that it enables us to observe the degree of power which 'sin' still possesses in the believer. But the ground on which he rejects them is not appealing. The Apostle, says he, presents himself as a constant victor; and impulses to sin constantly repressed are not sin. It is quite true, in itself, that 'the natural tendencies to sinful movements remain in Christians.' But it is not of them that this passage speaks. The natural tendencies which the Apostle here represents himself as crushing out were not only in themselves lawful, but their gratification would have been lawful. He was, for his work's sake, denying himself legitimate satisfactions of legitimate bodily needs.

We are far from learning from this passage that 'the Christian is distinguished from the heathen by his conscious thinking and conduct being uninfluenced by his concupiscence,—by being sinless.' What the passage teaches is that Paul, in the matter of the satisfaction of his bodily needs, denied himself, for his work's sake, above other Christians. The contrast is between himself and other Christian workers; not between the Christian and the heathen. And the contrast between the Christian and the heathen which is attributed to the passage, so misunderstood, would not be possible on Paul's lips. The conscious activities of the Christian are not thought of by him as cut loose from his underlying natural movements of impulse. The underlying natural movements of impulse of the Christian are not thought of by him as unaffected by his salvation. With him as with his Lord, the tree is made good that its fruit may be good: his very instincts he expects to be sanctified. So far as his activities were good, they were in his view good, not because they were unaffected by, but because in conflict with them they overcame, inward impulses which, being yielded to, would have made them evil.

B. B. Warfield.

Princeton Theological Seminary.

'The Only-Begotten.'

This is one of those half-metaphysical half-physiological terms the use of which in the Church might well be discontinued with advantage from every point of view. The expression is taken from the Latin *unicus*, which is a rendering of the Greek μονογενής, which again comes from the Hebrew יחיד.

This Hebrew word, however, does not mean 'only begotten.' It is used of Isaac (Gn $22^{2.\ 12.\ 16}$), who was not even the first-born, and very far from being an only son (cf. Gn 25). But we do not require to go back to the Hebrew. The Greek word μονογενής itself has not always the sense which the dictionaries give it. Thus Aquila and Symmachus use it of Isaac in the passages cited above, and so does the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (11^{17}). So also does Josephus (*Ant.* I. xiii. 1), as he does of Izates, prince of Adiabene, although he had a full brother older than himself, and other brothers besides (*Ant.* xx. ii. 1), whom Josephus mentions in the immediately preceding context: 'He (Izates' father) had Monobazu, his

elder brother, by Helena also, as he had other sons by other wives besides. Yet did he openly place all his affections on this his only begotten son Izates.'[1] But even the Latin *unicus* does not necessarily mean an *only* son. Thus in Plautus, *Captives*, Hegio speaks of one of his two sons as *unicus* (1. 147; cf. 150). Similarly, too, even in English, Aegeon in the *Comedy of Errors* calls one of his two sons his *only* son (v. i. 329).

All this seems to show that when in the New Testament, that is, in the Gospel and first Epistle of John ($1^{14.\ 18}$ $3^{16.\ 18}$ $1^{1.\ 9}$), Jesus is spoken of as the 'only begotten' son, this means no more than 'best beloved.' There is no implication that the birth of Jesus differed in kind from that of others. The LXX translation of the Hebrew Bible renders the Hebrew word יחיד in the passages referred to above by *ἀγαπητός*, as also in Jg 11^{34} (A), Jer 6^{26}, Am 8^{10}, Zec 12^{10}; as the English Version also rightly translates the feminine יחידה by 'darling' (Ps 22^{20} 35^{17}).

T. H. Weir.

University of Glasgow.

St. Chrysostom's Prayer.

All who have considered the English version of St. Chrysostom's prayer as given in our Prayer Book, must have been amazed that a Greek Father, who knew the Greek Testament and the Logia far better than any one knows them now, could have said 'who dost promise, that when two or three are gathered together in thy name, thou wilt grant their requests.' No promise was ever made that requests should be granted in the form in which they are asked; in Mt $18^{19\text{-}20}$ something will occur (*γενήσεται αὐτοῖς*), a boon will come to them, 'for where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.'

On looking at St. Chrysostom's prayer in the original Greek one finds an exquisite commentary on this passage: there am I in their midst, praying with them and translating their blind stammering cries into accord with the wider purposes of God and the coming of His kingdom, for I and my Father are one:

ὁ καὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶ συμφωνοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου, τὰς αἰτήσεις παρέχειν ἐπαγγειλάμενος· Αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν τῶν δούλων σου τὰ αἰτήματα πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον πλήρωσον· χορηγῶν ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ παρόντι αἰῶνι τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι ζωὴν αἰώνιον χαρισόμενος.

'Who also to two or three, if calling together with one accord upon Thy name, didst promise to offer their requests; do Thou thyself also now fulfil the petitions of Thy servants as may be expedient (for the coming of Thy kingdom), supplying us abundantly in this Age the fuller knowledge of Thy truth, and granting us in the Age to come the boon of Life everlasting.'

The meaning seems to be: 'Thou dost join with us in our requests, putting them into Thine own words, and so dost offer our prayers; Thou art also He who fulfils them.' The translation, 'as may be most expedient for them' is unwarranted by the Greek. No petitions will be fulfilled unless they are in accord with those in the Lord's Prayer, 'Thy kingdom come: Thy will be done.' It may be pointed out that all this is implied in the expression 'in Thy name,' but it is worthy of note that St. Chrysostom says *συμφωνοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι σου*, which has not the technical significance of *εἰς τὸ ὄνομά σου*.

This collect in the original Greek is the most perfect exposition on the subject of prayer.

Arch. Stanley Percival.

Newcastle-on-Tyne.

'Blessed are the pure in (of) heart, for they shall see God' (Matt. v. 8).

In ancient times, as in modern, the word *heart* was used as signifying the inner life of a man. There was, perhaps, this difference between ancient and modern usage of the word that the former does not distinguish to any extent between the intellectual and moral parts of that inner life as the latter is, at least conventionally, wont to do, hence *διάνοια* is found, in some passages, in certain Septuagint MSS. instead of *καρδία*; hence, too, phrases like 'every imagination of the thoughts of his heart' (Gn 6^{5}) and 'He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts' (Lk 1^{51}). In such expressions it is evident that the writer makes no distinction between what we usually differentiate as heart and mind. Perhaps such comprehensiveness is really the more philosophic way.

It has seemed to me for some time that one good interpretation of our Lord's words is that they are intended to give a hint as to the way in

[1] So Whiston.

which God judges a man. 'The Lord looketh on the heart.' As these words are used in respect of David and his brothers, they certainly refer, not to a detection, on God's part, of the motive a man may have for a particular act, but to the general state and trend of his inner life—'heart' being every phase of this inner life.

So Christ seems to be saying, '*You* think, Blessed are the surface-pure. You judge both righteous and sinners by surface qualities, the righteous by surface good qualities (I am not denying that they are good) and the sinners by surface bad qualities (I am not denying that they are bad). But God judges by the heart.' And if the *heart* is pure (I should say that καθαροί means almost childlike, or *fresh*) the outward impurities which a man can hardly help gathering in a workaday world matter the less. But, if the *heart* is otherwise, no amount of cleansing the outside of the cup and platter will make much difference.

It happens, accordingly, that certain publicans and harlots enter the kingdom before some other people, because, in spite of surface-impurities, their heart is fresh. And it happens that David is commended as a man after God's own heart, although he did some things which were very wrong; because, somehow, he managed to keep his heart sound, the wrong-doing, as it were, never ate into his manhood's fabric. But surface-impurities are not dismissed as of *no* account. The bathed are bidden to wash their feet, and to perform that office for each other, that they may be clean every whit. The heart-pure, that is to say, are to get surface-impurities removed.

The heart-pure's blessing is an instinct for finding God in persons, in things, in events. Where others will see but a loathsome human wreck, they will see God (they may not call it God; if not religiously inclined they will probably call it brother: it is all the same). Surface-purity cannot bestow, nor surface-impurity of itself withhold this instinct.

It is the natural concomitant of the inner condition of these people.

ARTHUR JONES.

Handsworth, Birmingham.

Psalm xlvi. 1.

'God is our refuge and strength,—
A very present help in trouble.'

THE forty-sixth Psalm has such a hold on the religious life of all Churches, and has become so potent a factor in their experiences, that many may deem it almost profane to suggest any departure from long-established readings. Facts must nevertheless be faced, and results will be found to justify change of view.

The primary impulse to examine this first verse carefully may be felt by one who reads only the common English translation, 'God is our refuge and strength,—a very present help in trouble.' The first half may be at once accepted without suspicion; but does it not seem strange that, in the second line, the Lord is described as a 'very present' help in times of distress? One can understand that He may fitly be viewed as 'present,' but presence or absence cannot properly be imagined as admitting of degrees: a person is either wholly present or wholly absent, not partly present or partly absent, and exception may thus reasonably be taken to the expression 'very present,' just as one may object to 'very full,' or 'very complete.'

This initial difficulty, however, naturally constrains us to scrutinize carefully the received Hebrew text; and the latter, when viewed with a critical eye, compels us to read it in a way different from that to which we have long been accustomed.[1] The truth is that translators generally have misread the Hebrew form נִמְצָא, by supposing it to be the Niphal (passive) participle of מָצָא ('find'), and thus to be rendered primarily 'found,' but more conveniently to be translated as 'existing,' or 'present.'[2] They do not seem, however, to have perceived the grammatical difficulty into which they brought themselves and others; for the noun עֶזְרָה ('help') is plainly a feminine noun; while נִמְצָא, which they mistakenly attached to it as its attributive, is undeniably masculine: this abnormality, unfortunately, has since been either intentionally ignored, or has not been even perceived. How, then, is נִמְצָא to be treated? Just as what it actually is,—not the Niphal participle, but as the first pers. plur. of the Qal,[3] which then takes the noun עֶזְרָה as its appropriate accusative, and enables

[1] The Septuagint reading of the second line (*βοηθὸς ἐν θλίψεσιν ταῖς εὑρούσαις ἡμᾶς σφόδρα*) gives no practical solution of our difficulties.

[2] See Gn 19^{15}, 'thy two daughters who are present'; 1 Ch 29^{17}, 'thy people who are present here'; Gn 47^{14}, 'all he money which was found in Egypt'; see also Jer 41^{3} 52^{25}, etc.

[3] The forms of these two parts of the verb are identical.

us legitimately to render the first part of the second line thus, 'help in distresses we find.'

But now, what is to be done with מְאֹד ('very'), the closing form in the verse? Certainly, it cannot be utilized as the Massoretes have unwisely fixed it for us, but a slight change in either of two directions will give good sense. It may either be read most simply as the resemblant מֵאֵיד ('from calamity,' or, 'against complete destruction'; see Job 18^{12} $21^{17.30}$, Ps 18^{19}, etc.); but as something of this meaning is already given in the preceding noun בְּצָרוֹת ('in distresses'), a preferable substitute is מְאֹל, which has most to commend itself.

Let us now summarize the benefits arising from adoption of the foregoing suggestions.

First, we rid ourselves of the questionable expression 'very present.'

Second, the grammatical irregularity in Hebrew Syntax produced by the combination 'a present help,' is quite removed.

Third, for the whole verse, there results a simple and beautiful parallelism, and this of a somewhat rare construction, in which the leading features of the first line are given *inversely* in the second: a divine name begins the first, but another ends the second; in the middle of each line there appears the plural of the first personal pronoun ('us,' 'we'); while mention of divine aid comes at the end of the first line, but at the beginning of the second. Thus—

> God [is] to us a refuge and strength;
> Help in distresses we find from the Almighty.[1]

JAMES KENNEDY.

New College, Edinburgh.

[1] On the change from אֱלֹהִים to אֵל, see Ps 7^{12}, etc.

Entre Nous.

SOME TEXTS.

Romans vi. 7.

Mr. Alex. Pallis, who is a Greek by birth and a scholar by training, has written a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The title is simply *To the Romans* (Liverpool Booksellers' Co., 70 Lord Street).

It is generally held now that the Epistle to the Romans was written in Corinth. Mr. Pallis does not believe that. There is no trace in it of the troubles then existing in Corinth. Nor does he believe that it was written to Rome. It is written to a mixed community of Jews and Gentiles who have become Christians, possessing *agapæ* and therefore an organized Church. But when Paul reached Rome afterwards there were no Christians there, certainly no Gentile Christians, the 'brethren' who met him being brethren according to the flesh. Nor was it written by the Apostle Paul. 'How could St. Paul have told such a puerile untruth as that he went so far as Illyricum? This journey and that to Spain are alike myths on a par with Andrew's tour throughout Thrace, Philip's journey to Parthia, and Matthew's visit to the land of the Sunless and Hole-dwellers.' And then 'the language of the Romans throughout lacks that spontaneity, unconventionality, and ruggedness which we so very much admire in the Corinthians and the Galatians.' Mr. Pallis believes that the epistle was written in Alexandria by some Jew. 'In its original form the epistle was fairly simple, and its simplicity probably commended it to the Alexandrian faithful and made it popular; with the result that, as it has happened more or less to other popular writings of antiquity, it was tampered with. One of the interpolators, a theologian—or perhaps more than one—tacked on long and irrelevant disquisitions between chapters 6 and 11; and the work was further amplified by all manner of accretions, so that finally it became one of the hardest to follow in Greek literature.'

Mr. Pallis's Commentary is as original as his Introduction. Take the note on Ro 6^{7}. The R.V. translation is, 'For he that hath died is justified from sin.' Mr. Pallis says: 'This is a most extraordinary statement; it is in flat contradiction with the view of future retribution, so firmly held by all Christians, and, as a matter of course, shared by our author. I believe that "he that hath died is justified" reproduces a proclamation customary

at funeral rites, which notified that the departed whose remains were being laid in the grave had obtained his grace from God, his wrongs to those present having been forgiven. This comforting idea is still alive among the Greeks, who generally refer to a dead man as ὁ συχωρεμένος. As a development, a dead man so forgiven, δεδικαιωμένος, became in the popular imagination a δίκαιος, *a sinless man, a saint.* Cf. Jn 17–19, *for their good I saint myself* (= *I die*). It is in this latter sense I think that the interpolator quoted the ritual words as a proof that we, having once died and become δίκαιοι, no longer shall be liable to sin.'

---

1 John iv. 3.

The A.V. reads, 'Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God.' The R.V. omits the words 'Christ is come in the flesh.' In the margin the Revisers offer 'annulleth' for 'confesseth not,' after another Greek reading. Dr. Gore in his new book on *The Epistles of St. John* (Murray; 6s. net) accepts that reading, but thinks that 'annulleth' should be 'dissolveth.' The text is of the utmost importance as St. John's test of discipleship. Every spirit, says the Apostle, that dissolveth Jesus is not a Christian. Dr. Gore takes it to refer to a doctrine which 'dissolves' Christ's person, 'and instead of acknowledging one person, the Son of God made flesh, postulates two persons or beings—a higher divine being called the Son or the Christ, and an ordinary human being called Jesus. Such teaching would accordingly involve the denial that the man Jesus was or is, in His own person, either the Son or the divine Christ, or, to put it otherwise, would deny the verity of the Incarnation—that truly and really the eternal Son was "made flesh."'

SOME TOPICS.

Interpretation.

Messrs. Dent have published a volume of lectures by Stopford A. Brooke on *Naturalism in English Poetry* (7s. 6d. net). They are well worth publishing. Never was Stopford Brooke happier in his chosen and well-worked field of study; never did he lecture with more enjoyment to his hearers. And now that his hearers have become his readers their enjoyment is not in any degree diminished. The lecture in which Wordsworth and Shelley and Byron are compared is one of the finest and truest tributes to Wordsworth's genius that we have ever read.

But what did Stopford Brooke's audience think when they heard the lecture on 'Shelley and Christianity'? Its vindication of Shelley from the charge of atheism is well enough, though it is not quite convincing. But the astonishing thing is that the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke, LL.D., identifies himself with Shelley in almost everything that he says about Christianity. Even this extraordinary attempt at interpretation is accepted: 'From that saying of "Be ye perfect, as your Father is perfect," Shelley infers that Jesus taught that the perfection of the divine and human character was the same. "The abstract perfection of the human character is the type of the actual perfection of the divine." And no truer thing can possibly be said of the teaching of Christ. "I and the Father are one." I, a man, am at one with the Father. This is what I am ceaselessly trying to teach as the very root of the doctrine of Jesus. He said it, not as God, but as a man—not for himself alone, but for all mankind. "We and the Father are one." And the poet saw that truth in Jesus, as we see it now. Indeed, it is the very foundation of all the doctrine of Christ; the ground of personal and social religion; the ground of all human associations and their duties; the ground of the rights of man and of their liberty, equality, and fraternity; the ground of their happiness and their immortality. It is the one saying we should inscribe on the banner of human progress: "We and the Father are one." It is a wonderful thing that Shelley saw this so many years ago, and saw it in the teaching of Jesus Christ.'

Scottish Life.

It may be that Dean Ramsay left some gleanings behind him; it may be that some of his stories can be told over again by this time; and it may be that the Scottish folk who have lived since Dean Ramsay's day are as truly Scottish as ever: in any case the Rev. T. McWilliam, M.A., Minister of Foveran in Aberdeenshire, has collected some fine examples of Scottish wit and wisdom into his book on *Scottish Life in Light and Shadow* (Gardner). The most characteristic chapter is the sketch of 'Weelum.'

'"Hulloa, William, that's a new horse you have got! What's become of the old white one?"

'"Well, minister," was the reply, "ye see, there wis some kin' o' knots aboot the beast—a thing I never kint o' in a horse afore, but ane's aye learnin'. I thocht I was gyaun tae loss 'im athegither, so I just selt him till anither man."

'"And what did the other man think o' the knots?" said the minister, with a demure face.

'What a twinkle there was in the old man's eyes as he replied, "Deed, noo, it niver occurred to me to mention the thing till him. I jist gied him the beast as I got him mysel."'

Mysticism.

Dr. Gore's definition is worth recording. It is quite clear and orderly. He is discussing in his book on *The Epistle of St. John* the question whether the Apostle John (whom he takes to be author of Gospel, Epistles, and Apocalypse) was a mystic. 'By the term "mystics" we describe a class of thinkers who have three special characteristics—first, that they are not content with a surface view of the world or with its external aspect, but (in Wordsworth's phrase) "see into the life of things"; secondly, that they have an intensely vivid perception of the unity of all things in God—they see God in all things and all things in God, and find in communion with God, aimed at and in part realized here and now, the chief occupation of their lives; thirdly, that their method of arriving at truth is not the method of argument or discursive reasoning, but the method of intuition; they do not arrive at truth by critical inquiry or antagonism to error, but by a sort of positive vision or feeling.' Was St. John a mystic, then? 'Now St. John has all those characteristics to an intense degree. He is thus intensely mystical.'

NEW POETRY.

Gladys Cromwell.

Gladys and Dorothea Cromwell 'were born in November, 1885, and inherited possessions, talents, and an exquisite beauty strangely poignant because in the twin sisters the charm seemed more than doubled. There are a few men and women with whom one feels a sense of spiritual mystery: one walks with them always on the road to Emmaus. It was true of these two. They found their home in the unseen. In the outer, material world they existed only by an effort that cost them much, for they moved as spirits, untouched by crude desires; bending with a shy longing to meet human needs; searching for some solution that should justify their personal immunities, their money, and the grace and luxury to which they had been born.'

'In January, 1918, the two sisters, having enrolled in the Canteen Service of the Red Cross, sailed for France and were stationed at Chalons. For eight months they worked under fire on long day or night shifts; their free time was filled with volunteer outside service; they slept in "caves" or under trees in a field; they suffered from the exhaustion that is so acute to those who have never known physical labour; yet no one suspected until the end came that for many months they had believed their work a failure, and their efforts futile. The Chalonais called them "The Saints"; during dull evenings, the poilus, who adored the "Twin Angels," found amusement in effort, always unsuccessful, to distinguish them apart. The workers in the Canteen loved and admired them for their courage—that finest bravery which leads fear to intrepid action; they loved them for their rare charm, but they gave them whole-souled appreciation for the tireless, efficient labor which made them invaluable as practical canteeners.'

'After the Armistice, when they returned to Chalons as guests, they showed symptoms of nervous prostration, but years of self-control and consideration for others made them conceal the black horror in which they lived—the agony through which they saw a world which they felt contained no refuge for beauty and quiet thought. In such a world they conceived they had no place, and when on their way home they jumped from the deck of the *Lorraine*, it was in response to a vision that promised them fulfilment and peace. They died on the 19th of January, 1919. Three months later they were buried in France with military honours, and the French Government has awarded them the Croix de Guerre and the Médaille de Reconnaissance française. They gave to the world lives of shining promise and crystal purity, having followed Him who said to His other disciples: Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend.'

These pines could feel the wind, the snow,
The April sun;
But through them now no changes flow.

These pines could feel the grief and mirth
Of quiet years;
But now they know unchanging dearth.

And they can feel no mood of spring:
Like certain souls
Who find in flame their blossoming.

That is the story. There is nothing to add to it. Gladys was the poet. Her book is *Poems* (Macmillan; $1.50). Take this poem on

THE CROWNING GIFT.

I have had courage to accuse;
And a fine wit that could upbraid;
And a nice cunning that could bruise;
And a shrewd wisdom, unafraid
Of what weak mortals fear to lose.

I have had virtue to despise
The sophistry of pious fools;
I have had firmness to chastise;
And intellect to make me rules
To estimate and exorcise.

I have had knowledge to be true;
My faith could obstacles remove;
But now my frailty I endue.
I would have courage now to love,
And lay aside the strength I knew.

Gilbert Thomas.

The name of Mr. Gilbert Thomas is familiar to the readers of poetry, for he has contributed poems to many periodicals, and he has published five or six volumes of poetry. Now Mr. Thomas has surveyed the whole poetical production of his life, and into one volume called *Poems: 1912–1919* (Swarthmore Press; 5s. net) he has gathered all the poems that he wishes to retain. Let one poem serve to stir the memory, or, if that is unnecessary, to determine the inspiration:

'NOT PEACE, BUT A SWORD!'

'Not peace! A sword I come to bring!'—
And with its keen edge didst Thou thrust
The empty pomp of priest and king
Into the empty dust.

Yet was Thy sword our peace! For spurned
Wert Thou, and for Thy blood they cried;
And so on Calvary they returned
The sword—into Thy side!

Nor dreamt they that it should release
(While vengeance thus they were demanding)
That sacramental flow of peace
Which passeth understanding!

Rhys Carpenter.

Mr. Carpenter is not careful to be reckoned a great poet. He sings because he must. He sings most happily when he has children for his theme. His 'Fairy Gold' is a vindication of the reality of the world of fairies. And once at least he becomes truly poetical in his tribute to the justice of British rule. Remember as you read the poem that Mr. Carpenter is a citizen of the United States of America:

A MARCHING SONG FOR ENGLAND IN THE EAST.

From Egypt into China they have builded them a wall;
They have held the front of Eden on the Teuton and his thrall;
On the snowy stairs of Elburz you may hear their bugles call,
'Ye are safe! be at ease! ye are safe.'

There are gardens in the southland where the Tartar may not go;
There is dewy corn in Babel where the desert used to blow;
In the vineyards over Gaza you may see the grapes aglow:
Ye are safe! be at ease! ye are safe.

You shall watch the ships adrifting with the Tigris under keel;
In the crooked streets of Baghdad you shall see the camels kneel
With the good things out of Persia that the robber could not steal:
Ye are safe! be at ease! ye are safe!

In the brain of wounded England lay the silence for a span;
Then she rose and wrought a marvel by the steppe of Turkestan;

Oh, ye women-folk of Irak; oh, ye children of Iran,
Ye are safe! be at ease! ye are safe!

The title of the book is *The Plainsman* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net).

Helen Dircks.

This is the preface to *Passenger*, by Helen Dircks (Chatto & Windus; 3s. 6d. net):

Passenger
Am I
In that machine of days
Which runs
Between the city and the stars;
No citizen
Of one delight
Or any stopping-place:
I journey
On and on,
Until
I shall become
A freight of dust
at last. . . .

And that is the manner of many of the poems. It is said to be an easy manner—but perhaps that was before it was tried. Once and again there is an ethical note struck, and it is worthy:

WITHHOLDING.

Ah, you will be no thief nor take
The false coin for the true,
Nor let a single soiled caress
Be passed between us two.

And yet you know how sweet 'twould be
To take what you might take;
But you do hold yourself in love
And honour for my sake.

As you have willed, so let it be,
My dear—and yet, more dear
Is all your true withholding than
If you had held me near.

S. Raleigh Simpson.

The author of *Nondescript Numbers* (Gardner), Mr. S. Raleigh Simpson, takes the writing of poetry light-heartedly. The gift of rhyming is most manifest. But the author has an ear for rhythm also. Here is one of the more serious songs:

CINNA'S SONG.

Some rejoice, while others weep;
Fixt the doom divine doth keep:
What man soweth he shall reap.

Silent as soft dews that fall,
Slowly, searchingly for all
Mills of God grind very small.

None can read the book of fate;
Death gives answer, swift or late:
Seek for light beyond heaven's gate.

Wilfred Rowland Childe.

A most unpretending book of poetry by Wilfred Rowland Childe is published by Mr. W. Brierley, Bond Street, Leeds, under the title of *The Hills of Morning*. But it is poetry. Feed your imagination on it. No price is named, but it will probably cost about a shilling. Feast your feeling for style upon it. Quotation is not easy where the variety is so manifold. But this sonnet may be given:

PRAYER TO THE AUGUST ORIGIN.

Let Thy love lighten on the land like rain,
O Father: bind the broken limbs and bless
With balsam our sick hearts: our nakedness
Raiment in glory. Like a flower from pain
Bid our devotion and our rapture rise.
Lo, in this Island cradled on the surge
Thou hast Thy gardens: bid all toilers urge
The herbs to grow, that when the summer skies
Of opulent June their sapphire patterns trace
Over the minsters and the shining streams
Of Albion, Thy belovèd, there may be
Plenteous reward for all Thy tender grace:
Let roses lovely as a poet's dreams
Cover the laughing land from sea to sea!

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE never was a time when the theologian was so ready to meet the man in the street. For the man in the street became the man in the trenches. The theologian got into touch with him. He was grateful to him. In some ways he greatly admired him. He found himself yearning over him in the very way in which God yearns over a sinner. He was willing, like the Apostle Paul, to become all things to every one of these men if by any means he might save some.

Now the difficulty which stands in the way of full understanding between them is the miraculous. The man in the street has his own experience. In that experience miracles do not occur. He has perhaps obtained a little knowledge of science. In the light of scientific knowledge they cannot occur. He has no difficulty with Christ. And if he would associate the miracles which Christ did with the Christ who did them, his difficulty might depart. But he takes them apart from Christ. He takes them one by one. He cannot see how it is possible for any man to walk on the water or to turn water into wine. He does not believe that any man can rise again from the dead. It is the miracles that stand in the way. And the theologian's great desire to-day is to meet the man in the street with a credible account of the New Testament miracles.

The late Mr. C. E. ROLT was a theologian. He was a friend of Dr. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, who wrote a book on the Resurrection of our Lord, and he criticised that book. He criticised it, we may believe, because it did not meet the difficulty of the man in the street. Then he wrote a book himself. He saw that the Resurrection was the key of the situation. Believe that Jesus rose again from the dead and you will believe that He walked on the water of the Sea of Galilee. Mr. ROLT wrote a book to show that Jesus had so peculiar a body that He might easily be believed to have risen from the dead. He died before the book was sent to press. But his friend, Dr. SPARROW SIMPSON, has seen it published. The title of it is *The Spiritual Body* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net).

To every human being, says Mr. ROLT, there are three possible bodies. One is the body in which we now live and move and have our being. Another is the body which we shall possess during the Intermediate State—the time between our own death and the General Resurrection. The third is the body in which we shall rise at the Resurrection and enjoy the heavenly life for ever. If you wish to distinguish these three bodies by names you might call the first the physical, the second the psychical, and the third the spiritual body.

Mr. ROLT believed that this is the teaching of

St. Paul. He believed that it is the teaching of our Lord. He believed that both our Lord and St. Paul taught that the one body passes imperceptibly into the other, so that a man is weaving the second or third body, unseen by others and even unknown to himself, whilst he is still in the possession of the first or second body. And the weaving will be the more active and effective according to the character of the man.

If a man is 'earthly, sensual, devilish,' there will be little progress made in his psychical body while on earth. If he is spiritually-minded, the psychical body will actually make known its existence in moments of great elevation, as it did to St. Paul that day he was carried up to the third heavens and knew not whether he was in the physical body or out of it. If a man is as spiritually-minded as was the Lord Jesus Christ, he will not have to wait for death to enjoy the possession of the psychical body. And when death comes the physical body will simply pass away. Three days will suffice for its passage. And the man will rise into the intermediate life clothed in the psychical body.

Thus Christ rose from the dead. Thus it was that He could not be holden of death. Death had no more dominion over Him. For death is the death of the physical body, and for Him the physical body was ready to pass into the psychical. It is true He appeared to His disciples after His resurrection in a visible body. Mr. ROLT explains that its visibility was an accommodation to their want of faith. At one time the body seemed to be more physical, at another less. Sometimes He took food; at other times He passed in and out through closed doors. It was a matter of accommodation. They had all—every one according to his individuality—to be convinced of the fact of His resurrection.

But during those forty days which elapsed between the Resurrection and the Ascension, He was living not in the physical, but in the psychical body. Those forty days were His 'Intermediate State.' With the Ascension, He left the psychical body also behind, and entered into possession of the spiritual body—that body in which we shall see Him face to face, what time we are to be changed into the same image from glory to glory.

But what became of the physical body? Is not the present body made of matter, and is not matter indestructible? Mr. ROLT replies that our science is obsolete. The most recent science has exploded all the old theories of the indestructibility of matter. Matter is simply energy. When the physical body of Christ passed into the psychical, the energy which formed the one body passed into the other body and no residuum of 'matter' was left in the tomb.

Just before our Lord's ascension, as St. John tells us, He breathed on His disciples, and said 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost.' Why did He breathe on them? The act was unusual. When He gave forth power in the days of His flesh, it was by means of the sense of touch. He touched the leper. The suffering woman touched the hem of His garment.

Nor has the act been repeated. When the Bishop or the Presbytery would confer power or authority, it is the laying on of hands that is the act resorted to. Why did Jesus breathe on His disciples?

Mr. C. E. ROLT, in the book just noticed, sees significance in the breathing. 'As we read the passage,' he says, 'can we not feel that this breathing was no act of ordinary breathing? If we try to realize the scene, there is perhaps something grotesque in the suggestion that our Lord in the ordinary sense breathed upon His disciples. Surely that which the Evangelist is trying to express but cannot, because all human words fail him, was a spiritual process by which a spiritual influence like the Pentecostal wind streamed forth from the Saviour's lips and touched that little band

and sank into their hearts and bathed them in unutterable bliss and sweetness. The sheer grotesqueness of the incident, if the words are taken to mean what they would ordinarily mean in our earthly life, a grotesqueness so out of keeping with the austere and gracious majesty of the events in which the passage is embedded, makes this spiritual interpretation of them seem almost inevitable. Moreover, the fact that there were several present points in the same direction. Our Lord might, of course, be conceived of as breathing on each one separately and then pronouncing the words to all of them together; but the account seems to suggest that He not only addressed them but breathed on them all together. And this would be almost an impossibility if it were an act like physical breathing.'

What was it, then? It was an act, and an appropriate act, of the Son of God now ready for His Ascension. It was the first act of the Spiritual body. It was a spiritual breathing. 'Just as He touched the sick with the hands of His physical body to convey the gift of physical health, so He breathed on them in His Risen Body to convey the Holy Spirit. Thus the Holy Spirit was actually in some manner radiating from the breath He breathed. He breathed the power forth to show that it came from the depths of His own being. The breath of life is an apt symbol of the Spirit, as the very etymology of the word "spirit" shows. And thus the very act of giving the Spirit by this means was a claim to be the Source and Origin of all the Church's spiritual life.'

In *The Galilean* (James Clarke; 5s. net) the Rev. Nathaniel MICKLEM, M.A., Tutor and Chaplain of Mansfield College, Oxford, makes an energetic effort to commend the Christianity of the New Testament to the modern mind. The modern mind is an after-the-War mind. It is also the mind of a young man. It demands reality and reasons. Mr. MICKLEM endeavours to furnish both.

Can he secure reality in Prayer? Can he give good reasons why an after-the-War young man should pray? Can he persuade him to pray for others? Mr. MICKLEM is not without a sense of his difficulties, but he is thoroughly practical and thoroughly modern even in what he has to say of intercessory prayer.

He sets down two preliminary cautions. First, Prayer is not a dodge. Simon Magus thought it was. There was a secret in it. Put him up to the trick of it and he will work miracles by prayer, as any one. But there is no trick in it. It is the response of love to love—the love of God to a man who loves his brother.

Next, Prayer is not a compulsion. If the person who prays is free to pray, the person prayed for must be free to enjoy the benefit of the prayer. Much as God desires to do us good, He forces no good thing upon us, not even in answer to other good men's prayers for us. It is very clear to Mr. MICKLEM that if one man is to benefit by another man's prayers there must be some sort of correspondence between them. Both must be willing in the day of God's power.

He gives an instance. 'If,' he says, 'by prayer I can compel so-and-so to give money to the poor, there is no kindness in his doing so; I have not awakened his insight nor enabled him to do what is right because he himself sees it to be right; I have used a kind of violence with him.'

How then is intercessory prayer effectual? Mr. MICKLEM's answer is that it creates an atmosphere. 'There are certain people who as soon as they come into the room bring with them, as we say, such an "atmosphere" as that all that is best in us is fortified and strengthened, and in their presence it is comparatively easy for us to do what we know to be right. If they could compel us, there would be no value in their presence, but *they* enable *us* to do the right. Now when we pray for someone absent, I conceive that in effect we go and stand

by them; we cannot compel them, but we can help to create an atmosphere for them in which it is easier for them to do that which is right. If we pray for a sick friend, we stand by him and help him to overcome if it be possible. If we pray for a tempted friend, we stand by him and help him to fight his own battle and to overcome.'

It is strange that our Lord's temptations are so rarely taken into the pulpit. There seems to be a feeling that they are His and His alone. They belong to the history of His life. The scenery also is peculiar to Palestine—the wilderness with its wild beasts, the unnamed high mountain whence all the kingdoms of the world could be seen, the wing of the Temple in Jerusalem. And as the scenery is peculiar to Palestine, so the experiences (if they were experiences) are supposed to be peculiar to Christ.

Is that so? It cannot be so, else had they not been recorded. If there were experiences of Christ which it is impossible for us to suffer or enjoy we may be sure that their tale was never told. The story of the Temptation in the Wilderness, as we call it, came from Jesus Himself. What purpose could He have in telling it if it was an experience in which we could have no share?

We are distinctly told that He was tempted in all points like as we are. But even with that text to work upon, and with what Henry Drummond called the subject of most consequence in human life to preach about, how rarely does the preacher use the temptations of our Lord to show what temptation is; how rarely does he enable us to see that they cover the whole range of our experience; how rarely does he draw the victorious conclusion that just because He was tempted in all points like as we are, it is possible for us to count it all joy when we fall into divers temptations.

Is the order of the temptations of any account? Is it of any consequence whether we adopt St. Matthew's order or St. Luke's? The Rev. W. J. Foxell, M.A., who has made an able and thorough study of *The Temptation of Jesus* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. 6d. net), does not seem to think so. For he shows that the more likely order is St. Luke's, and then proceeds to follow St. Matthew.

The more likely order is St. Luke's. It is not the more popular order. For we read the Gospel according to St. Matthew first and become familiar with his way of telling the story. There is just one argument in favour of the order in St. Matthew, and Mr. Foxell gives it all its value. It is the argument that the most impressive of the three scenes is that on the top of the high mountain where Jesus was shown all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them in a moment of time. It is impressive, but it is not an argument in favour of that order. For it is easy enough to understand why one of the evangelists should have arranged the three temptations in an ascending order of impressiveness, and St. Matthew is fond of such artistic arrangements; it is not so easy to understand why another evangelist should change the order and spoil the climax.

In favour of St. Luke's order is St. Luke himself. He was a historian. He took pains 'to set forth *in order* a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us.' It is therefore open to any preacher to follow the order of the temptations as he finds them in the third Gospel—the wilderness, the high mountain, the pinnacle of the Temple—if he finds that there are good reasons for doing so.

And there are good reasons. One thing we may be sure of—the order is not accidental. Clearly enough the three temptations are meant to cover the whole range of human temptation, and in all human temptations there is an ascending order of importance. It is not outward impressiveness. It is inward assault. Now if we divide a man's avenues of temptation into three classes we shall see that they assail the bodily appetites first, next the desires of the mind (or soul), and last of

all the aspirations of the spirit. In other and clearer words they are first physical, next social, then spiritual. In the clearest and best words of all, they are first temptations within a man's own individual self, next temptations in his intercourse with others, last of all temptations in respect of his attitude to God.

And that is the order of the temptations in St. Luke. In the Wilderness Jesus was tempted to make use of His peculiar gifts—gifts given for a special purpose—in the satisfaction of His hunger. The word of the devil is the proverbial wisdom of the world. Think first of yourself. Charity begins at home. Jesus answered pregnantly that a man's first thought must be the will of God. The will of God covers the needs of the body, but they do not come first—'all these things shall be added unto you.' 'Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, that man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.'

Let us not think that the temptation to the body is simply the temptation to indulgence. Indulgence, whether in eating or in drinking or of any other appetite, pays its own penalty at once, and with ever-increasing heaviness. The temptation is to claim for the individual life its rights without consideration of the rights of others, or of the purpose of God.

When Jesus had fasted for forty days it was no question of indulgence to ask Him to eat. But there was a higher claim just then, and the higher must always precede. It was the claim of the will of God, as He saw it. When the soldier is in the trenches, short of food or of water, it is no concession to his bodily appetites to invite him to eat and drink. But he can eat and drink only by leaving the trenches and becoming faithless to duty.

Next comes the temptation to the mind. Now it is not necessary to say that the mind is greater than the body. Each has its place. The mind must not claim attention regardless of the body, nor the body regardless of the mind. If the athlete's 'fitness' is obtained at the expense of the cultivation of his mind it costs too much; if the culture of the mind is obtained with the loss of bodily health it costs too much.

Again, the temptation to the mind is not the temptation to indulgence. Here also indulgence —leaving undone the things that ought to be done, or doing the things that ought not to be done, whether it is due to moral weakness, the tyranny of habit, sheer indolence, or momentary rebellion—receives its own inevitable reward, and we know it. The temptation to the mind, before which rise the ideals of beauty, truth, and goodness, is more exquisite than that.

It is the temptation to desire to do good without paying its price. The devil invited Jesus to a high mountain, showed Him all the kingdoms of the world, and offered to let Him have them. The devil knew that He desired to have them, though he may not have known how ardently. He had come to make them His own, in order that He might make them God's. But He must pay the price. And the price is Calvary.

For this is in accordance with the will of God and the constitution of the Universe. We are ambitious. We have gifts, gifts given us by God, gifts of influence, leadership. We wish to use them in God's service. We would do good with them. But no good can be done in God's universe without sympathy. And sympathy is never anything else than 'suffering along with.'

Is there any right-minded man or woman in this land who does not desire a diminution of the evils due to alcoholic drinking? How are they to be diminished? There are two ways—but both involve sacrifice. One way is to deny oneself the use of alcohol by way of example. It is the easier way. The Apostle Paul recommends it. The question in his day was meat—not any kind of food, but food offered to idols. What did he

say. 'If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.'

The other way is to recover the drunkard. It is the harder way. For it is to 'feel with,' to 'suffer with,' the drunkard's wife and children; it is to suffer with the drunkard himself. That is done by removing his temptations, and especially by the patient labour of rescue. And 'the Salvation Army lass,' throwing her arms around the woman who has become degraded into a drunken sot, and kissing her swollen discoloured lips, is doing more to overcome the temptation to the mind (the 'social soul,' men call it now) than the millionaire with the best use he can make of his money.

The temptation that assails the spirit is in the way of experiment. And here let us notice that the three temptations of Jesus, being the three temptations of man, are the three temptations of Eve. What are the words? 'And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat' (Gn 3^6). 'Good for food': 'command this stone that it become bread'; 'pleasant to the eyes': 'he shewed him all the kingdoms of the world'; 'and a tree to be desired to make one wise': 'cast thyself down from hence'—the parallel is so perfect that it is scarcely possible to suppose it accidental. What more likely than that Jesus threw His narrative into a form which was already familiar and which covered all the range of possible temptation?

The temptation that assails the spirit is in the way of experiment. For in the Eden of every man's life there is a tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and he is forbidden to eat of the fruit of it. It is a tree to be desired to make one wise, but that wisdom is beyond the will of God for us. They will tell us that we are bound to know evil sooner or later in any case. So we are. But what do they mean by 'bound'? If they mean by the laws of the Universe or the will of God, they are wrong. The only compulsion is the failure of the will to respond to the call of God. That is evil, and the knowledge of it, and that only. We are not bound to take and eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. And if its fruit is beyond the limits of God's purpose for us, or if it trespasses on the rights of others, to take of the fruit and eat is to fall before temptation.

It is a matter of experiment, of experiment with God. Now experimenting with God is not always wrong. Without the dash of adventure that is in it there is no true faith, and without faith there is no true fellowship. But the venture of faith is never in the direction of breaking the commandments, always is it in the way of observing them. The venture that is made for the satisfaction of curiosity—as when the young lad takes strong drink in order to know how it feels to be drunk; or for the unfettered enjoyment of existence, as when the young girl determines at all costs to see life—is experimenting with God in the way that the devil invited Jesus to experiment when he told Him to cast Himself down from the wing of the Temple.

Ah, you will be no thief nor take
  The false coin for the true,
Nor let a single soiled caress
  Be passed between us two.

And yet you know how sweet 'twould be
  To take what you might take;
But you do hold yourself in love
  And honour for my sake.

As you have willed, so let it be,
  My dear—and yet, more dear
Is all your true withholding than
  If you had held me near.

It is simply the setting of our own will against the will of God. The will of God may seem to work along a narrow groove, it may seem to be

slow and even ineffectual in its working, but if it is the will of God there is nothing for us but to wait upon it. To hasten its working, to turn it into a new channel, to widen its scope, is certain to end in disaster. And when the disaster falls it is poor consolation to remember that we thought we were doing it for the best. They say that Judas Iscariot was guilty of nothing worse than a desire to make Jesus reveal Himself. He would put Him in a corner, where He would be compelled to declare His Messiahship and accept His crown. It was an interesting experiment. But it ended on Calvary for Jesus, and on Aceldama, the Field of Blood, for Judas.

Belief in God and its Rational Basis.

By the Reverend J. Dick Fleming, D.D., Professor of Theology, Winnipeg.

Since the time of Immanuel Kant it has been customary, for theologians and philosophers alike, to concede that the existence of God is not a matter of reason, but only of faith. The critical philosophy of Kant was directed to prove, on the one hand, that since the categories we employ in our thinking have validity only in the field of the empirical consciousness, we can only conceive, without being able to comprehend or verify, the Absolute realities; and on the other hand, that the Absolute reality from which our theoretical reason is thus debarred is made known to us by the Practical or moral reason. In other words, theoretic knowledge concerns itself with the realm of nature, the things of sense-experience; the realm of ends, which is the Absolute reality, is shut out from science proper, and must be relegated to moral faith. We know only phenomena, the things of space and time; the ultimates of existence are only matters of moral persuasion. Hence philosophy must limit itself to a criticism of the categories and forms of our knowledge; while those absolute realities, with which Ontology formerly dealt, have their true place in the moral sphere, as ethical postulates of the practical life.

In varying language and under somewhat modified forms, this distinction has largely prevailed in the thought of the nineteenth century. It reappears, in its Kantian form, in Hamilton and Mansel; in Herbert Spencer's doctrine of phenomenalism, which relegates religious faith to the realm of the Unknowable; and in the Ritschlian and other theologies which are based on Kant, and maintain that our beliefs in the supersensible rest on Value-judgments. It reappears in a more directly empirical form in the activism of Eucken, in Bergson's exaltation of intuition and instinct above the theoretic intelligence, and even in modern Pragmatism. In the last form, however, it threatens to abolish the theoretic side of knowledge altogether; for the pragmatist proclaims that all truth has its value ultimately in its practical application, and that the test of truth is its working value.

This agnostic, or anti-intellectualist, attitude of mind seems to be in a fair way of working out its own salvation. The original doctrine here was that knowledge properly so called is confined to phenomenal experience and has a higher degree of rationality within these limits than the faith which carries us beyond phenomena. But the advancing anti-intellectualism of our time is beginning to criticise this distinction, and to recognize that if the knowledge of things seen is only phenomenal and partial, it has no valid claim to be exalted above the other factor—call it faith, intuition, or moral will—which brings us into living touch with reality. Very few adhere to the extreme view of Spencer that the non-phenomenal is absolutely unthinkable. It is widely recognized that the conclusions of faith are quite capable of being intelligently stated, and the reasons for these conclusions intelligently given. But if they thus yield us deeper insight into reality than that which the scientific intellect gives, why should we refuse them the title of knowledge? Why not allow that they belong to a higher kind of reason, which deals with things beyond sense by methods that are proper to them? No one, of course, would deny that we have many practical beliefs and intuitions which we have never rationalized; that is true not only of our faith but also of all our

ordinary 'knowledge.' But we cannot make a single statement in any realm of thought which we do not implicitly declare to be reasonable and justifiable. Is not all science—including philosophy—the endeavour to verify, deepen, and enlarge this elementary knowledge or faith of the ordinary mind?

Further, it is a mistake to suppose, as the critics of rational metaphysics do, that science and metaphysics are distinguished by the fact that the one keeps within the limits of experience, while the other attempts to go beyond these limits. The very first step in science is a step beyond the visible to the invisible nexus of things. On the other hand, while metaphysics, dealing with the whole of experience, inevitably passes beyond the sense-world to its deeper meanings and implications, it does not repudiate its starting-point in experience. If metaphysics finds the ultimate truth to lie in the unseen and eternal, wherein is it more venturesome than the science which, starting from only a part of experience, finds the ultimate reality in ions or electrons?

Coming more directly to the question before us —the reality of God—we find that the rational grounds for a belief in God's existence have assumed in the main these four forms: the Causal argument, from the contingency and change manifest in the world to unchanging necessary Being; the Design argument, from the order of the world and its conformity to ends, to the Infinite Mind; the Ontological argument, from the very thought of God to His existence; and the Moral argument, from the moral life of man to the moral Governor of the Universe. Here again the authority of Kant is invoked; and it is the fashion to regard these old dogmatic props—the first three at least —as obsolete fallacies, annihilated by the critical philosophy.

Are we to suppose, then, that reasons which appealed to Socrates and most of the master-minds in philosophy and theology up to the time of Kant, have been disproved and shorn of value by a few strokes of Kant's critical pen? Kant himself knew better; and lest there be some who accept Kant's authority without having opened his *Critique of Pure Reason*, let us hear how Kant himself expresses his mind on these old arguments. 'The world around us opens before our view so magnificent a spectacle of order, variety, beauty, and conformity to ends, that whether we carry our observation into the infinity of space in the one direction, or into its illimitable divisions on the other, whether we regard the world in its greatest or in its least manifestations, even after we have attained to the highest summit of knowledge which our weak minds can reach, we find that language in the presence of wonders so inconceivable has lost its force, and number its power to reckon; nay, even thought fails to conceive adequately, and our conception of the whole dissolves into an astonishment beyond the power of expression—all the more eloquent that it is dumb. Everywhere around us we observe a chain of causes and effects, of means and end, of birth and death; and as nothing has entered of itself into the condition in which we find it, we are constantly referred to some other thing which itself suggests the same inquiry regarding its cause; and thus the universe must sink into the abyss of nothingness, unless we admit that, beside this infinite chain of contingencies, there exists something that is primal and self-subsistent—something which, as the cause of the phenomenal world, secures its continuance and preservation.' Is this eloquent presentation of reasoning, in which Kant really combines the teleological argument with that of causality, finally repudiated by the philosopher? In form and details, yes; but in substance, no! 'This argument,' he says, 'always deserves to be mentioned with respect. It is the oldest, the clearest, and that most in conformity with the common reason of humanity. . . . It would be utterly hopeless to attempt to rob this argument of the authority it has always enjoyed. The mind, unceasingly elevated by these considerations, which though empirical, are so remarkably powerful, and continually adding to their force, will not suffer itself to be depressed by the doubts suggested by subtle speculation; it tears itself out of this state of uncertainty, the moment it casts a look upon the wondrous forms of nature and the majesty of the universe and rises from height to height, from condition to condition, till it has elevated itself to the supreme and unconditioned Author of all.'[1] So Kant speaks; and yet those who regard themselves as his followers proclaim that Kant has destroyed these arguments and robbed them of all value! What is true is that Kant could find no place

[1] *Critique of Pure Reason*, Dialectic Bk. II. ch. iii. sec. 6.

for them in his system of philosophy, and was led, in spite of his recognition of their value, to deny that they were absolute demonstrations. The special difficulties raised by Kant were not new; what was new was his contention that the mind's categories were only suited to grasp phenomena, and thus the understanding was from its very constitution incompetent to deal with noumenal reality. But do the modern thinkers who invoke Kant's authority accept his system—his abstract distinction between phenomena and noumena, between sense and understanding, between *a posteriori* and *a priori*? We may safely say they do not. But if we set Kant's system with its mechanical distinctions aside, the old proofs remain where they were—Kant himself not denying their force for the common reason.

But, it will be said, some of the objections presented by Kant remain, whether his entire system be accepted or not. Thus, we cannot logically deduce the infinite from the finite; we cannot speak of a 'cause' of the world seeing that causality is only applicable to the parts of the world to one another; we cannot conclude to necessary being from contingent being, or from the limited design in nature to the infinitude of wisdom. Such arguments against the proposed proofs of God's existence were presented long before Kant's time; and they are more conclusive from the point of view of formal logic than from that of the real logic of thought. Neither science nor philosophy has bound itself by rules of formal demonstration; but both alike have insisted on advancing from particulars to the universal, and from the facts assumed to some principle which transcends and explains them.

Coming to the objections themselves, we should probably be accused of quibbling with words if we argued that just as phenomenal reality implies noumenal reality, so the finite implies the infinite, and the changing or contingent implies the unchanging and necessary. The accusation would be just if the noumenal reality were, as the Kantian conceives it, a mere unrelated Absolute, and if the infinite had no relation to the finite. But if the phenomenal is the appearance of the noumenal, if the contingent is the changing appearance of the abiding, and the finite the veritable manifestation, in partial form, of the infinite,—why, in reason's name, should we not advance from one to the other? If it be still objected that we cannot, by any kind of logic, conclude from anything to the opposite of that thing, and that there are no terms more opposed than contingent and necessary, conditioned and unconditioned, finite and infinite,—we may reply that those who charge the idealist with 'vicious intellectualism' should beware of it themselves. Vicious intellectualism, as Professor James defines it, is 'the treating of a name as excluding from the fact named what the name's definition fails positively to include.' Now, the things we call finite and infinite are opposed in respect of their magnitude, whether extensive or intensive; but they may be otherwise one in innumerable ways. In fact, absolute opposites are unthinkable. But if finite and infinite are related in manifold ways, the one being the dependent existence, the other the ground-existence, why in the name of reason should we not argue from the one to the other? Nay, is the finite world absolutely finite? Can we conceive it otherwise than as resting on the bosom of infinitude?

But the Kantian theologian will again invoke his master in reference to the Ontological argument. Kant has shown, it is said, that the empirical arguments drawn from experience of the changing phenomenal world rest ultimately on the purely *a priori* Ontological proof. And this proof, which argues in various fantastic ways from the very idea of God to His reality, has been refuted a thousand times before Kant; but Kant has finally extinguished it by showing that the *a priorism* which argues from mere conception to real existence is a glaring *non sequitur*.

But before setting aside a type of reasoning that has appealed to the greatest minds from Augustine to Hegel and down to the present day, we may surely ask if there is not a substance of truth in it. Grant that it is illogical to argue directly from a psychological idea to the real existence corresponding to it; grant that apart from experience all 'pure' reasoning is empty and void; may it not still be true that our experience, when we analyse it, is found to contain the idea, and along with the idea, the reality of the Infinite Being, the Absolute Intelligence?

The general distrust with which the Ontological argument has been viewed is due to the very inadequate form in which it has been stated. To say, with Anselm, that the idea of a Perfect Being involves reality, because a perfect being who did not exist would be inferior to one who did exist,

i.e. would not be perfect, is only a logical quibble. One might argue quite as logically that Satan, the vilest being, must needs exist, because if he did not exist he would be less vile than a monster that did exist, and so would not really be the vilest being. Much more reasonable is the special argument put forward by Descartes in his *Discourse of Method*, that the real existence of the infinite and Perfect Being must be assumed, as being the only adequate explanation of the existence of the idea in ourselves. There is no principle more commonly affirmed by the radical empiricist of to-day than that all our ideas, however complex, imaginary, or distorted, run back to some root of reality. That is to say, the elements of which any idea is composed are constituted by some past experience which brings us into touch with the real. What, then, is the original experience which will explain the idea of the Infinite and Perfect? Whence has the idea come? Surely not from our sense-experience which yields only the finite and imperfect. It cannot be made up by addition or multiplication of finites; for no combination of finites brings us nearer to the infinite, nor any addition of imperfect things to the perfect. Nor can the infinite be explained away as being a mere negation; the word is negative of the finite, but the idea itself is no more negative than that of the finite itself. Whence, then, comes the conception of the infinite and perfect, if not from the Infinite and Perfect Being Himself?

But the Ontological argument, as stated elsewhere by Descartes, and as interpreted by others, is much more than a mere causal argument from the idea in the mind to its origin in real existence. It is rather the argument that the reality of God is verified directly and immediately by the very idea of God; or, as Descartes says, the necessity of God's existence imposes itself upon our thought, in the same way as the idea of a valley is necessary when we think of a mountain, or as, when we think of a triangle, the equivalence of its three angles to two right angles is rationally imposed upon us. Later idealism fills out this argument by pointing out that reality is rationality, and that all our judgments base themselves on this presupposition of rationality, that is, of the presence of universal mind. We may put the same thing in simpler fashion by saying that the same process of thought which leads us to the conception of God as Infinite Mind leads us of necessity to assume His reality. When we reflect on our experience as a whole, we cannot help arriving at the conception, which carries with it the reality, of the Infinite and Perfect Being. As our sense-experience leads us inevitably to the realization of the infinity of space and time, and our scientific study leads us on to the idea of Infinite power or energy; so our reflexion on the process and the validity of knowledge reveals to us the implicate of Absolute Truth or Infinite Mind; and our moral nature reveals the Infinitude of Goodness.[1]

It is true that these lines of reasoning do not furnish a solution of all problems as to the Divine nature. They lead us to the conception of Infinite Being, Infinite Intelligence, Infinite Moral Will. But the modern mind will still inquire whether this Infinite Being possesses also Personality, and, again, whether God, if He is a personal being, can be identified with this Infinite Being at all. We can speak of infinite mind, and infinite energy or will; but is not personality a limiting anthropomorphic conception? The theory of a 'symbolic' knowledge of God is widely accepted by modest philosophers who recognize the difficulty of combining the thought of infinite being with that of a progressive realization of truth, which human knowledge implies; or with the thought of imperfectly realized ends, or with the thought of personal emotion and passion. Other thinkers again, who have little taste for metaphysics and prefer the idea of a Divine person to that of an abstract Infinite or Absolute Being, favour the conception of a personal 'finite God' as being more in line with the common understanding. Still others maintain that any doctrine of God as the Absolute Being is inconsistent with the freedom of finite beings, and declare that God must be finite, at

[1] The division made between *a priori* and *a posteriori* arguments has only led to confusion. All argument takes its start in experience, and is verified by experience. In fact, the distinction has never been greatly favoured by philosophers; but it has maintained itself in this connexion because it is commonly held that experience contains only what is finite. Were that true, the argument from experience must appear as a somewhat venturesome leap into the dark; and the 'pure' *a priori* argument might commend itself as starting from the pure speculative realm, and entrenching itself in the infinite reality. In truth, however, the Ontological argument, when rightly understood, is the general summary of the other arguments; it is the expression of that movement of the mind which insists on running out into the Infinite.

least in the sense that He has limited Himself, and even that He is eternally self-limiting.[1]

But whatever difficulties remain unsolved in the doctrine of Infinite Personality, they are as a drop in the bucket when compared with those that meet us when we seriously accept such vagaries as are offered in its place. Infinite intelligence without a centre of personality is pure abstraction personified. A 'finite God' implies that some other principle is needed for the ultimate explanation of things; and those who argue in favour of such a God seem to be scarcely able to persuade themselves of His existence.[2] On the other hand, the conception of a God who has limited Himself from all eternity will strike the ordinary mind as a sheer contradiction in terms.

Some of the difficulties which surround the conception of God as Infinite Personality, and which have led to such impossible solutions, are due to an erroneous conception of the relation of the infinite to the finite. The general underlying assumption seems to be that the Infinite Being, conceived as the All-being, must sublate and destroy all finite self-reality and freedom. But while it is a serious problem so to present this relation as to allow room for the self-reality of the finite without resolving the Infinite into the abstract totality of being, the solution does not seem impossible. Infinite space includes all finite spaces, both transcends them and is immanent in them. Infinite time or eternity transcends all finite times; yet it is immanent in all times. So the Infinitude of the Divine Personality transcends all finite beings, all human personalities, and is nevertheless immanent in all. The double doctrine of the transcendence and immanence of the Infinite Personality is not a combination of two contradictory pictures; it is essential to the very conception of the infinite.

[1] Ward, *Realm of Ends*, Lectures XI. and XX.

[2] McTaggart, *Some Dogmas of Religion*; and Mill, *Essays on Religion*.

Literature.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

The Bampton Lectures for the year 1920 were delivered by the Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D., who chose as his subject *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion* (Murray; 12s. net). It is the subject which is now occupying the attention and interest of Anglican theologians more than any other. But to Dr. Headlam it is not a study of yesterday or of to-day. He has given his life to it. Whatever interest Christ has had for him personally, professionally his chief interest and occupation has for thirty years or more been the doctrine of the Church. And Dr. Headlam is a High-churchman.

What do we expect? We expect that the unique opportunity of the Bampton lectureship will be used by him to defend a 'high' theory of the Church, a theory fixed and settled in his mind long ago. And what do we find? All our expectations vanish. Dr. Headlam determined, when appointed Bampton lecturer, that he would follow the historical method of study strictly, and state fearlessly the conclusions to which it led him. He knew what the historical method meant. He knew that to profess to follow it was one thing, to follow it another. He knew that Bishop Gore had professed to pursue the historical method of study in his book on *The Church and the Ministry*, but (he says in a footnote) 'the reader will notice throughout that the dogmatic presentation always precedes the history, and that the function of the latter is to prove rather than to instruct.'

What are the conclusions? One conclusion is that Episcopacy is not a form of Church government to be found in the New Testament. 'There are no definite Biblical arguments in favour of it. The name we have, but its signification is different. Attempts have been made to find arguments in favour of it, the position of James the Lord's brother, the Angels of the Churches in the Revelation, the language of the Pastoral Epistles. A more careful exegesis will show us that these arguments are based upon misinterpretation. There is no Biblical authority for Episcopacy.' And Dr. Headlam is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and Editor of the *Church Quarterly Review*.

What then? Then the question arises: Are we to be guided in our Church polity by the New Testament or by the subsequent practice of the Church? Whereupon Dr. Headlam proceeds to the investigation of the doctrine and practice of the early Church. And the result? The result is that 'the ministry of the Apostolic days was in form wholly temporary. When we next have any full knowledge of its life we find that the Apostles, prophets, and evangelists are a memory of the past, the embryo Church Sanhedrin is swept away, the local churches are no longer governed by a body of presbyters, but by bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and the bishop is the official minister of the whole Church.'

THE POWER OF PRAYER.

In May 1916 the Walker Trust of the University of St. Andrews issued a circular inviting essays on Prayer, and offering a prize of a hundred pounds for the best essay sent in, with the prospect of additional prizes 'at their discretion.' One thousand six hundred and sixty-seven essays were received. The prize was awarded to the Rev. Samuel McComb, D.D., Canon of the Cathedral of Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A. Additional prizes were presented to William Loftus Hare, Director of Studies in Comparative Religion and Philosophy to the Theosophical Society, London; the Rev. Edward J. Hawkins, Minister of Southernhay Congregational Church, Exeter; the Rev. S. H. Mellone, M.A., D.Sc., Principal of the Unitarian Home Missionary College, Manchester; and the late Rev. Alexander Forbes Phillips, St. Andrew's Parish Church, Gorleston, Suffolk. A volume has now been published, containing the best essays (or most of them), and containing an introductory essay of extraordinary interest by Professor W. P. Paterson. Its title is *The Power of Prayer* (Macmillan; 18s. net). It is a handsome volume, and well edited by Professor Paterson and Mr. David Russell. It contains a Bibliography of Prayer, by the Rev. W. C. Fraser, the best bibliography of the subject we have seen. Mention should also be made of the Index—as nearly as possible what an index should be—the work of the Rev. Frederic Relton.

The most outstanding characteristic of the volume of essays entitled *Concerning Prayer*, edited by Canon Streeter and published recently by Messrs. Macmillan, was the unanimity of the writers; the most prominent feature of this volume is their variety. There is surely no aspect of prayer and no attitude to prayer which has missed an advocate or at least an expositor.

Passing through the book one is arrested by an essay on Prayer from the Anthropological Point of View. Its author is Mr. Edward Lawrence. This aspect is not sufficiently studied. Mr. Lawrence surveys the phenomena of Prayer first among uncivilized races and then among peoples that are civilized. Even among the lowest races he finds petitions which cannot be denied the name of prayer. Their only fault is their selfishness—a fault which has prompted Sir James Frazer to remark irreverently that 'if only wrestling in prayer could satisfy the wants of man, few people should be better provided with all the necessaries and comforts of life than the New Caledonians.'

But the importance of this particular essay lies in its recognition of a fact of much significance and hopefulness. It is the fact that although the outward observance of Religion is disregarded and its beliefs repudiated, yet interest in Religion as a study was never more general or more intense than at the present time. 'If,' says the essayist, 'it were necessary to indicate, by one fact more than another, how great this interest is, we might point to that valuable and monumental work, THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, now in course of publication, which deals with all the main factors of religious life and culture, with its mythology and its history, its superstitions and its ethics, its philosophy and psychology.'

How are we to account for it? Had we as preachers gone beyond our hearers' power to follow us? Had we demanded belief for doctrines which they could not believe? Had we insisted upon a standard of conduct which they could not reach? And did they, in consequence and in disgust, turn from us altogether? Then came the war. And with the war came the necessity of finding God and duty. And they began again at the beginning.

THE THEORY OF THE STATE.

Messrs. Macmillan have issued a third edition of Professor Bernard Bosanquet's book on *The Philosophical Theory of the State* (15s. net). It

contains a new preface, in which Dr. Bosanquet says: 'In the third edition several pages have been added to the Introduction, some footnotes have been inserted, dated 1919, and the Index has been enlarged. I avoid, so far as possible, re-writing the text. I think it fairer to the reader to give him the means of following the development of a writer's thought together with its reasons.'

Now the book was first published in 1899, the second edition (little altered) in 1910, and even since the later date, much has happened in reference to the theory of the State. In especial the great European War has happened. And the theory of the State which Professor Bosanquet upholds is just the theory which has had so much to do with the war, or at least with its German justification. It is strange, therefore, that no reference is made to that fact in the new edition.

The theory goes back in the main to Hegel. It represents the State as a super-individual, a superhuman quasi-divine personality. It is the central conception of the political philosophy of German 'idealism.' It is an instance of one of those philosophical ideas which claim to be the product of pure reason, yet in reality are adopted for the purpose of justifying and furthering some already existing interest or institution. In this case the institution in question was the Prussian State; and those, Hegel and the rest, who set up this doctrine, were servants of that State. They made of their doctrine an instrument for the suppression of individuality which greatly aided in producing the servile condition of the German people. Clearly it was to be expected that some justification of a theory with such palpable and pernicious effects should have been attempted in the new edition. All the more that Dr. Bosanquet is himself its chief representative in this country, and that, mainly through his advocacy, it has had a very great influence at Oxford.

Some recent books are noticed in the new preface, but no mention is made of Professor L. T. Hobhouse's *Metaphysical Theory of the State*, although (to quote the judgment of so good a scholar as Mr. McDougall) 'in that volume Prof. Hobhouse has subjected the political philosophy of German "idealism," and especially Dr. Bosanquet's presentation of it, to a criticism which, as it seems to me, should suffice to expose the hollowness of its claims to all men for all time.'

JOHN ROBINSON.

If the Tercentenary of the Sailing of the Pilgrim Fathers had produced nothing else it has produced a really good biography of *John Robinson, Pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers* (Williams & Norgate; 12s. 6d. net). Mr. Walter H. Burgess is an authority on Pilgrim history. He has himself done much research work and made some interesting discoveries. 'Besides the identification of the early home and the parentage of John Robinson, these pages throw a little fresh light upon the Southworths and Carvers and others connected with the Pilgrim Father movement. Gervase Neville is identified, and the anonymous opponent of Robinson in one of his earliest controversies is named. The history of the obscure Church in the western parts of England is unfolded, and an attempt made to settle the vexed question of the identity of John Smith.' It is a modest claim. There is much new matter in the book besides, some of it conjectural, but some of it reliable.

The book is written by an enthusiast, for enthusiasts. The uninstructed may be somewhat wearied now and then with names and dates. But he would be ill-instructed indeed, and impatient, who did not find the personality of the Pilgrims' Pastor enough to hold his interest to the end. How modern he is! All the world has heard of his saying about further light yet to break forth out of the Word. The saying occurs in a report by Edward Winslow of Robinson's farewell sermon to the Pilgrims as they left Leyden. The whole report is worth quoting, but the first two or three paragraphs will be enough to show the modern, that is to say the prophetic, spirit of the man.

'Amongst other wholesome instructions and exhortations he used these expressions, or to the same purpose—

"We were now ere long to part asunder; and the Lord knoweth whether ever he should live to see our faces again. But whether the Lord had appointed it or not, he charged us, before God and his blessed angels, to follow him no further than he followed Christ: and if God should reveal anything to us by any other instrument of his, to be as ready to receive it, as ever we were to receive any truth by his Ministry. For he was very confident the Lord had more truth and light yet to break forth out of his holy Word.

"He took occasion also miserably to bewail the

state and condition of the Reformed Churches, who were come to a period in religion; and would go no further than the Instruments of their Reformation. As, for example, the Lutherans: they could not be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw, for whatever part of God's will he had further imparted and revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it. 'And so also,' saith he, 'you see the Calvinists. They stick where he left them, a misery much to be lamented.

"'For though they were precious shining lights in their Times, yet God had not revealed His whole will to them; and were they now living,' saith he, 'they would be as ready and willing to embrace further light, as that they had received.'"'

THE GROUP MIND.

The new series of books entitled 'The Cambridge Psychological Library,' which is under the editorship of Professor G. Dawes Hicks, and of which the first volume was Professor James Ward's *Psychological Principles*, has now been enriched with a volume on *The Group Mind*, by William McDougall, F.R.S., Fellow of Corpus Christi College and Wilde Reader in Mental Philosophy in the University of Oxford (Cambridge: at the University Press; 21s. net). Mr. McDougall is the author of many works in Psychology. He has also done some work in the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.

The new volume is the successor to his *Introduction to Social Psychology*. Of that book it was said: 'Mr. McDougall, while giving a full account of the genesis of instincts that act in society, hardly shows how they issue into society. He seems to do a great deal of packing in preparation for a journey on which he never starts.' On which the author remarks: 'The last sentence exactly describes the book.' The journey which he then prepared for he now takes.

He has had some trouble with the title. 'I have chosen,' he says, 'the title, "The Group Mind," after some hesitation in favour of the alternative, "Collective Psychology." The latter has the advantage that it has already been used by several continental authors, more especially French and Italian psychologists. But the title I have chosen is, I think, more distinctively English in quality and denotes more clearly the topic that I desire to discuss.'

What, then, is the group mind? Does it differ from the mind of the individuals who compose it? It does. That is the theme of the book. 'For the aggregate which is a society has, in virtue of its past history, positive qualities which it does not derive from the units which compose it at any one time; and in virtue of these qualities it acts upon its units in a manner very different from that in which the units as such interact with one another. Further, each unit, when it becomes a member of a group, displays properties or modes of reaction which it does not display, which remain latent or potential only, so long as it remains outside that group. It is possible, therefore, to discover these potentialities of the units only by studying them as elements in the life of the whole. That is to say, the aggregate which is a society has a certain individuality, is a true whole which in great measure determines the nature and the modes of activity of its parts; it is an organic whole. The society has a mental life which is not the mere sum of the mental lives of its units existing as independent units; and a complete knowledge of the units, if and in so far as they could be known as isolated units, would not enable us to deduce the nature of the life of the whole.'

Mr. McDougall examines and fully recognizes the mental and moral defects of the crowd and its degrading effects upon all those who are caught up in it and carried away by the contagion of its reckless spirit. He then goes on to show how organization of the group may, and generally does in large measure, counteract these degrading tendencies; and how the better kinds of organization render group life the great ennobling influence by aid of which alone man rises a little above the animals and may even aspire to fellowship with the angels.

The volume is divided into three parts. The first part contains the General Principles of Collective Psychology; the second brings these principles to bear upon the National Mind and Character; the third part shows how the National Mind and Character develops, or may develop, under the influence of these principles.

SENECA.

'Seneca's reputation has passed through many vicissitudes. He has been long neglected, and his character when discussed has been harshly

appreciated. Yet good wine cannot come from a tainted vessel; and if we judge his work by the use that has been made of it by famous poets and moralists, we must call it a noble heritage. Shakespeare and Milton have transmuted many of his thoughts into glorious poetry—Milton taking directly from him, Shakespeare in all probability by way of Florio's Montaigne. From the first he has excited admiration and hostility in almost equal measure. He is perhaps the only pagan whom the early Christian writers—Tertullian, Augustine, Lactantius, and Jerome—regarded with all but unmixed approval. On the other hand, the pedantic Roman archaists of the Antonine period—Aulus Gellius and Fronto—detested him as the corrupter of taste and a dangerous innovator. It must always be remembered that his was no abstract philosophy of the study. It was addressed by a former man of action to men living under a reign of terror, whose lives were in daily peril; and its object was to free them from anxiety and brace their minds to meet their fate with indifference and dignity. Consequently it is in dangerous times that he has found the greatest favour.'

With these words Mr. Francis Holland closes his biography of *Seneca* (Longmans; 10s. net). They are enough to make his attitude evident. He is not a panegyrist, but he is an admirer. He has to admit the authenticity of the shockingly fulsome 'Consolation to Polybius,' but he has excuses for its flattery even of a Claudius. Otherwise 'Seneca was no flatterer; for the noble panegyric of the young Nero's clemency, written before the emperor had forfeited all title to that virtue, and at a time when it was of high importance to the commonwealth to interest the vanity which was his ruling passion in the maintenance of his reputation in that regard, was not flattery.'

Again, Mr. Holland acquits Seneca of guilt in connexion with the murder of Agrippina, in spite of the letter which he wrote for Nero. 'After the deed had been done, Seneca probably convinced himself that there was nothing better to do than to make the best of a bad situation, and that if to desert his post, to abandon Burrhus, and to leave the Empire to the mercies of Nero would be an unpatriotic course, the only alternative was, not to condone the crime, but to deny that a crime had been committed. "What better proof can a man give of devotion to virtue," he wrote in one of his letters, "than a readiness to sacrifice reputation itself for conscience' sake?" Yet when all is said, the letter to the Senate remains of all the recorded actions of Seneca the least defensible.'

NEGLECTED ENGLISH CLASSICS.

In 1906 Mr. John Grant of Edinburgh issued an edition of Horace Walpole's Letters, as edited by Peter Cunningham, in nine handsome illustrated volumes. It was a great opportunity for the twentieth century to own and read the whole correspondence of 'the Prince of Letter Writers.' But to own is one thing, to read another. Nine large volumes are not easily compassed. And yet it is not enough to read a little, to dip into this volume and that. For Horace Walpole if he was a gossip—and they say that every letter worth reading has to be written by a gossip—was also a historian. 'The history of England,' says Leslie Stephen, 'throughout a very large segment of the eighteenth century, is simply a synonym for the works of Horace Walpole.' And so it is necessary to know the letters as a whole if we are to know the history of England and if we are to know Horace Walpole himself.

The Rev. W. G. Robertson, B.D., Principal and Professor of English Literature in Gujarat College, Ahmadabad, has made this possible, and without demanding of us that we should read or even possess all Horace Walpole's Letters. He himself has gone through the letters for us, most carefully, most capably, letter by letter, volume by volume, and has gathered their contents into one splendid essay. He has not missed the history and he has not missed the man. He has set the history of Walpole's time as he saw it in the light of that history as we otherwise know it; he has corrected mistakes and criticised judgments; and above all he has pictured within the compass of a single literary essay the man, Horace Walpole, as he reveals himself in the immense and immortal mass of his correspondence.

In doing this Principal Robertson has a definite object in view. He is a teacher, a teacher of English literature. There are certain portions of our literature which are neglected in schools and colleges and even by accomplished students, because of their magnitude or difficulty. We can learn about them in our manuals and cyclopædias,

but that is not enough. We ought to know them. That is Professor Robertson's object, and that object he has attained. Besides Horace Walpole's letters, the volume, of which the title is *Neglected English Classics* (Aberdeen: Wyllie; 6s.), contains four plays that were favourites with eighteenth century playgoers, namely, Otway's 'Venice Preserved,' Farquhar's 'Beaux' Stratagem,' Addison's 'Cato,' and Gay's 'Beggar's Opera'; together with two of Richardson's novels, the longest two—'Clarissa Harlowe' and 'Sir Charles Grandison.'

The book is very readable, and it is likely to be read by those who are content with reading. But it is just as likely that it will be used by teachers of English Literature as a text-book. If any of the works which it contains and criticises should be set in examinations, it is the first book that the student should turn to. He will scarcely require to look into another.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Dr. George McCall Theal continues his *History of South Africa*. He has now carried the history of the country down to 1884, the two volumes last published covering the years 1873 to 1884 (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net each).

It is a minute history, and, as we have assured ourselves by the reading of earlier volumes, it is a minutely accurate history. The men who made history in South Africa are all named, even the separate acts of the separate regiments of the British Army find record, and all without confusion of person, regiment, place, or date. Nor is Dr. Theal a partisan. It is true that in the account of the Zulu War, for example, he takes the view decidedly that the power of Ketshwayo (his own spelling) had to be broken, and that it was impossible to be nice in the choice of means by which to break it. But he is far from favouring that form of patriotism which is altogether indifferent about the means if the end is gained.

The disaster at Isandhlwana is well described. There is no rhetoric; there are few words of blame; but the whole shameful scene is spread out before the reader with unfailing eloquence. At one point one sees the black host creep stealthily along, and can scarcely forbear to cry out, as if he could utter the warning word.

From the Abingdon Press in New York there comes an efficient manual for teachers and parents entitled *How to Teach Religion* ($1.50). The author is Mr. George Herbert Betts, Professor of Religious Education in Northwestern University. It is dedicated 'to those who have in their keeping the religious destiny of America—the two million teachers in our Church Schools.' One thing is impressed upon the teacher at once—the supremacy of religion. Next comes the stern demand that the teacher should himself, and for himself, set religion first: 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness.' Then follow the rules and methods—so easily learned then and so easily taught. There is a chapter on 'Religious Attitudes,' of great worth, and giving the book worth, were there no other chapter in it.

The second volume of 'The Pilgrim's Books,' Messrs. Philip Allan's new series, is a selection of passages from *The Tatler*. It is called *Toasts, Rakes, and Cits* (5s. net), and is further described as 'Portraits of Maids, Men, and Matrons fashionable and unfashionable "about town" in the eighteenth Century.' The volume is made for the pocket. When it is in it the pocket will carry all that is now worth reading of the writing of Steele or Addison or any other in that short-lived but immortal periodical.

'We have got to make our people clearly understand that worship is not mere edification and certainly not a form of entertainment, but an ordinance whose whole soul and meaning is sacrificial.'

The English is not elegant, but the meaning is clear. That is the reason why the Rev. W. G. Peck has assisted in the formation of a Society of Free Catholicism, although he is a Methodist. Some time ago he told the story of the Society. Now he publishes a volume of essays bearing on the subject, with the title *From Chaos to Catholicism* (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net). The essays (one is on G. K. Chesterton and another on R. H. Benson) are vigorously written.

Why does Mr. Peck not become a Roman Catholic? His answer is: 'We do not recognize any inspiration or spiritual confidence in her absolutist methods of government and order. And if she persists in these methods, she will prove herself finally as much a curse as a blessing.'

Why does he not become an Anglican? His answer is that 'until the Church of England has expunged the slur and stigma of the Elizabethan Settlement, her influence in Christendom will always lack some elements of spiritual power.'

Another of the accomplished lives lost in the war finds record in the volume entitled *Arthur Innes Adam* (Bowes & Bowes; 10s. 6d. net). Arthur Innes Adam was the second son of the late Professor James Adam, the great Cambridge Platonist (we use the word in its scholarly not its theological meaning). The biography has been written by his mother, Mrs. Adela Marion Adam—scholar and Platonist also. It is written with perfect candour and in perfect taste. The idea of taste does not even enter. Nor does the thought of concealment. This lad (he fell in September 1916, at the age of 22) was above reproach, easily taking all the highest honours and easily exhibiting all the highest virtues. There is, curiously, no thought of precocity attached to him, though he did things as a child in the learning of languages which recall the miracle of John Stuart Mill. He was too full of life, too comprehensive of interests, to be counted precocious. And he was too generously modest. It may be impossible to point to a single thrilling incident in the whole book, but the book itself is enough. It is good to know that such a lad lived; it is good to believe that when he had fulfilled his few days he went to the higher service for which his life here was manifestly preparation.

At the University of London Press there is published a volume of *King's College Lectures on Immortality* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). The volume is edited by the Rev. W. R. Matthews, M.A., B.D., Dean of King's College, London. The lecturers are Dr. J. F. Bethune-Baker, Prebendary A. Caldecott, Dean Rashdall, Professor William Brown, and Dr. H. Maurice Relton. The most valuable contribution to a subject on which it is now extremely difficult to say anything valuable that has not already been said seems to be made where it is least expected—on 'the Christian Contribution to the Conception of Eternal Life.' This essay is written by Dr. Relton. We do need clearer exposition of that phrase 'eternal life.' We need a surer estimate of its importance for daily living. We need stronger emphasis laid upon its place in the thought of the Lord and His Apostles. Dr. Relton has done all these things for us.

In *Realities and Reconstruction* (Lindsey Press; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. R. Travers Herford, B.A., makes a distinction between reform and renewal. He finds both methods advocated in the Bible—Reform by Isaiah ('Prepare ye in the wilderness the way of the Lord'), Renewal by the writer of the Apocalypse ('I saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God'). In the one passage there is to be a reformation of the earth by hard work; in the other there is to be a complete renewal, the gift of God. Mr. Herford believes in reform. By patient labour is the reconstruction of the present chaos to be brought about, not by the methods of revolt.

Mr. H. Stanley Redgrove, B.Sc., F.C.S., has written a book on *Bygone Beliefs* (Rider; 10s. 6d. net). The beliefs are mostly mediæval; they are all grotesque. And in grotesque beliefs Mr. Redgrove takes great delight. He hunts them up everywhere. He illustrates them whenever an illustration can be found, and the illustration is as grotesque as the belief. Thus he produces a book which is quite entertaining if one has an unoccupied hour or two, and may even be instructive. There is much mixture of subject—Pythagoras and his Philosophy, Superstitions concerning Birds, the Quest of the Philosopher's Stone, the Cambridge Platonists—and that is only a selection. The mixture is in the writing as well as in the subject. On one page Mr. Redgrove bids us 'beware of the exaggerations into which certain schools of thought have fallen in their estimates of the powers of the imagination. These exaggerations are particularly marked in the views which are held by many nowadays with regard to "faith-healing," although the "Christian Scientists" get out of the difficulty—at least to their own satisfaction—by ascribing their alleged cures to the Power of the Divine Mind, and not to the power of the individual mind.' On another page he quotes from Dr. Haddon the story of 'a young Congo negro which very strikingly shows the power of the imagination. The young negro, "being on a journey," lodged at a friend's house; the latter got a wild hen for his breakfast, and the young man asked if it were a wild hen. His host

answered "No." Then he fell on heartily, and afterwards proceeded on his journey. After four years these two met together again, and his old friend asked him "if he would eat a wild hen," to which he answered that it was tabooed to him. Hereat the host began immediately to laugh, inquiring of him, "What made him refuse it now, when he had eaten one at his table about four years ago?" At the hearing of this the negro immediately fell a-trembling, and suffered himself to be so far possessed with the effects of imagination that he died in less than twenty-four hours after.'

In some Sunday schools a new method of teaching the Scripture lesson is being adopted. It is called the Dramatic Method. The pupils are encouraged to imagine the scene or incident, and to identify themselves with the persons in it. Is it one of the Parables? Is it the Parable of the Sower? Give the sower a name (Boaz); let each of the soils (good, rocky, weedy) be owned by a different farmer, and give each farmer a name (Joash, Esau, Reuben); introduce a friend of Jesus and an enemy (Nathan and Judah). Then let each child represent one of these characters, imagine the situation, create the language, and act the whole scene.

The Rev. A. E. W. Sheard is a strong advocate of the method. In *Living Parables* (Skeffington; 5s. net) he gives many examples of how the Parables may be thus dramatized and acted.

In the year 1819 the Secretaries of the Foreign Missionary Societies, with headquarters in London, formed themselves into an Association for mutual counsel and fellowship. In the month of October 1919 was celebrated the Centenary of the Association. An account of the proceedings at the Centenary has been published under the editorship of the Rev. J. H. Ritson, D.D., and with the title *Records of Missionary Secretaries* (United Council for Missionary Education). The little book is of much value as well as interest, for it contains four addresses: one on 'The Men of the Past,' by Dr. Eugene Stock; one on 'The Things they Talked about,' by Dr. Ritson; one on 'The Outlook in Co-operation,' by Mr. J. H. Oldham; and one on the Future, with the title 'Abounding in Hope,' by the Rev. W. Y. Fullerton.

Mr. Fisher Unwin has published a new edition of Lord Morley's *The Life of Richard Cobden* (8s. 6d. net). The new edition is in one volume of nearly a thousand octavo pages. Its frontispiece is a fine portrait of Cobden.

When was the book first published? The publishers say: 'First edition, 2 vols., demy 8vo cloth, 32s., London: Chapman and Hall, 1879.' But the preface here quoted, which seems to be to the first edition, is signed 'September 29, 1881.' It is interesting to observe the issue of the various editions. Taking the publishers' statement we have 1879, 1881 (two), 1882, 1883, no more till 1896; then one edition in 1902 and four in 1903 (the first keen year of the tariff reform controversy), one in 1905, and one in 1906. The Liberals came into power then, and the controversy ended. Is the new edition issued in the prospect of another controversy?

The Pilgrim Fathers and the Oxford Movement.

By Herbert G. Wood, M.A., Director of Studies at Woodbrooke Settlement, Birmingham.

To associate the followers of John Robinson with the followers of John Henry Newman may seem as hopeful as the attempt to mix oil and water. The Pilgrim Fathers and the Tractarians are naturally supposed to be as distinct from one another in spirit as they are distant in time. And yet there are real points of affinity between the two movements. It is not an idle paradox to assert that the true significance of the Oxford Movement lies in its endorsement of positions taken up by the Pilgrim Fathers. It might cogently be argued that the enduring contribution of the later movement to the religious life of the English Church lies in its kinship with the earlier, and not in its renewed

insistence on the doctrine of Apostolic Succession and the necessity of sacramental grace. The theory of Apostolic Succession has proved very dubious in point of scholarship. Indeed, it is no longer contended that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, as Tractarians promulgated it, is the doctrine of the Church of the first three centuries. In their views of sacramental grace, it is not clear that the Tractarians made any appreciable advance on earlier theories. They did not render such theories more intelligible or more profound, nor did they relieve them of the difficulties which they have always presented.

On the other hand, the movement from the first asserted more or less explicitly the autonomy of the Church, an assertion which is now finding its first effective organic expression in the Enabling Act. The Free Churchman is attracted to the Oxford Movement in its early stages by its emphatic protest against Erastianism. It is hardly necessary to illustrate this, but it is characteristic that the keynote of Newman's popular studies of the Church of the Fathers was the independence of the Church over against the State. He dwells on the picture of Ambrose resisting an Empress and rebuking an Emperor. The Church lives her own life and declines the dictation of the State. The very stress on Apostolic authority as constitutive of the ministry is due to the conviction that the Church can no longer rely, and ought no longer to rely, on social prestige and the patronage of the State. Now in all this, the Oxford Movement was unconsciously justifying the Puritans and the Separatists. That was the Puritan principle. The Church has her own genius, her own order. She will welcome the support and protection of the State if they are given without compromising her government and her worship. But if the Church is to be made subservient to the interests and policies of the State, she is placed in an intolerable un-Christian bondage. The Oxford Movement began in the revival of a Puritan principle and can only issue in the establishment of that principle, to wit, the securing of full self-determination to the Church of Christ in England.

It is interesting to observe that Hurrell Froude at least was aware of this affinity. Among his memoirs there is this passage: 'I have been reading a good deal lately about your friends the Puritans in Queen Elizabeth's time: and really I like poor Penry very much. I think of writing An Apology for the Early Puritans, whose case I take to be this. The Church of England had relinquished its claim to be the *jus divinum* and considered ordination to emanate ultimately from the Queen. These poor fellows, *i.e.* Penry & Co. (not Beza & Co., nor Knox & Co.), detested so abominable a notion, but what could they do? They had been bred up in a horror of trusting history in matters of religion, so they could look for a divine institution and a priesthood nowhere but in the Bible. Here, then, they looked, assuming as an axiom that they must find; and finding nothing more reasonable than the platform, they caught at this. In the meantime, our people and the smug fellows on the Continent were going on with their civilities to one another and servilities to their respective Governments and left these poor men to fight for a *jus divinum* though not the true one. It seems to me that Saravia and Bancroft are the revivers of orthodoxy in England and that the Puritans shielded them from martyrdom. Had it not been for their pertinacity in claiming a *jus divinum*, that tyrant (Queen Elizabeth) would certainly have smothered the true one.'[1] Newman and his friends declined to contribute to the Martyrs' memorial in honour of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, but if they had been asked to subscribe to a memorial to the Congregationalist martyrs, Barrow, Greenwood, and Penry, they ought to have responded generously. For their true Apostolic Succession comes through these men and not through the Anglican bishops.

There is another link between the Oxford Movement and the Puritans and Separatists, namely, their view of the importance of Church discipline. It is true that they meant very different things by discipline, but they agreed that a church which could not enforce her own rules of life and order on her members, was a maimed and shackled Church. The article of the Church of England which defines the visible Church of Christ as 'a congregation of faithful men: in which the pure word of God is preached and the sacraments duly administered,' omits any express reference to discipline, and defenders of the Anglican position were glad of the omission in controversy. For the Puritans maintained that the Church was defective not only in that the word was not preached purely, and the sacraments not administered sincerely, but also in that ecclesiastical discipline was wanting. The

[1] Guiney, pp. 125, 126.

Separatists took the course they did take in order to live together under a true Christian discipline. Similarly, one feature of the Tracts is the way they draw attention to the decay of discipline in the Church of England and plead for its restoration. It is part of the Church's independence that she disciplines her members, and her powers of discipline ought not to be determined by the State. Here too High Churchman and Separatist are agreed.

This agreement extends to detail. It embraces the question of the marriage law. The Pilgrim Fathers accepted the Dutch practice, which regarded marriage as a civil contract. So far the standpoint of the Pilgrim Fathers is, of course, radically different from the standpoint of the modern High Churchman. But they would have agreed with the High Anglican of to-day in denying the right of the State to impose upon the ministry the duty of conducting marriage ceremonies as ecclesiastical rites when ministers themselves feel them to be nothing but civil contracts. The probable divergence between State law and Church law on the subject of marriage and divorce is compelling the High Churchman to take up a position indistinguishable from that of the early Separatists. The Rev. Alfred Fawkes, preaching before the University of Cambridge on May 16th, 1920, says of Bishop Gore's desire to establish a sharp distinction between religious and civil marriage, that it involves 'a direct attack on the royal supremacy, *i.e.* the supremacy of the law of the land, and that *it reduces the church to the level of a denomination or sect.*' This is essentially true, though both High Churchman and early Separatist would re-phrase the second criticism and say it raises a nondescript social institution to the level of a church. The problem of the future of the divorce laws of this country is not yet settled, but it may very well be that the solution accepted will force the heirs of the Oxford Movement, practically as well as theoretically, into the position of the Pilgrim Fathers.

If the necessity of separation is forced upon the High Churchman, it lends additional interest to the fact that in the Tracts positions are asserted which disable them from charging the early Separatists with schism. In Tract 4, on 'adherence to the Apostolical succession, the safest course,' Keble admits that this adherence is only a binding duty, 'provided that nothing heretical or otherwise immoral be inserted in the terms of communion.' Tract 51 dealt with Dissent and laid down a similar principle. It admits that separation on account of some fundamental doctrine is not only not a sin but a duty. An illustration is supplied in a note: 'If the State religion became Roman Catholic, it could not be our duty to conform to that because we should thereby compromise some of the fundamental articles of our faith and admit others to be fundamental, some of which are not so,—and others which not only are not so, but are moreover in themselves false.' The Tracts are singularly unsympathetic and even perverse in their treatment of Dissent, but unconsciously they concede the main principle. For men like John Robinson separated from the Church of England with great reluctance and only under the strongest conscientious compulsion. They separated out of Christian charity towards those from whom they separated. They thought things heretical and immoral were being made conditions of communion. They believed that fundamental articles of faith were being compromised, and that they were being asked to affirm as fundamental articles which were not so. Every test proposed by the Tractarians, of a justifiable separation, is fulfilled in the case of the Pilgrim Fathers. The Separatists cannot justly be accused of the sin of schism. Nor will it do to say that the grounds on which they separated were mere matters of opinion which they ignorantly and mistakenly made matters of conscience. It cannot be denied that the terms of communion offered to Puritan ministers by Whitgift really involved something immoral and something heretical. The Puritans were asked to make what was for them an immoral affirmation regarding the Prayer-book and to accept an heretical view as to the supremacy of the State over the Church. The demand for this affirmation was itself immoral. The Separatists were more conscientious than the Puritans. However we criticise their general theories, their action cannot be impeached. As Christian men, they could do no other, the Tractarians themselves being witnesses.

It cannot be asserted that Erastianism is everywhere abandoned. Some still cling to the idea of a National Church equivalent to the community on its religious side; and they believe that the community on its religious side may be regarded as a Christian Church. For example, it is supposed by

Mr. Fawkes that the English people neither desires nor would tolerate a non-Christian marriage law. Now it is true that the community has its religious side; it is true that most people desire or tolerate something religious in connexion with the great common experiences of men—birth, marriage, and death. A friendly critic once said of Mr. Crawley's books on Folk Lore, that he had taken great pains to show that the primitive savage, with his ceremonies at birth and marriage and death, was a member of the Church of England, 'which,' added the critic, 'of course he was.' The desire for some religious sanction at marriage is very general. In the far West in America, the need has sometimes been met by a judge reading the Declaration of Independence! But to assume that because the community has these religious instincts it is therefore on its religious side a Christian Church is an obvious fallacy. It may or may not be desirable to make some public provision to satisfy these religious instincts. It is manifestly undesirable to assume that you are thereby expressing Christianity. And it confuses men's minds as to the nature of Christianity when a Church exists avowedly for the sake of a political community and the gratification of its simpler religious instincts, and then claims also to be representative of Christianity. The gulf between genuine Christianity and the modern State is obvious and unbridged. A Church dependent on the State and entangled in the existing social order can never be what Christ's Church ought to be in the world. If we are not yet convinced of this theoretically, we shall soon be forced to recognize it practically. Unless the Church has an independent life, she will go under. Unless she bears an independent testimony, she will get, and she will deserve, no hearing. The verdict of the Christian conscience with regard to the essential autonomy of the Church, is that of Cartwright and John Robinson rather than that of Whitgift and Hooker. The future lies with the conception of the Church which the Oxford Movement and the Pilgrim Fathers held in common.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

I.

Birthdays of Good Men and Women.

'Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven.'—Mt 18^4.

Last month I told you of a happy home which was also a very beautiful one.

But beautiful surroundings and true happiness do not always go together. Some of you must have already discovered that. People may, in fact, get nearer to each other's hearts when there is little to look at than when amidst great beauty. If you were having a holiday and driving through a part of the country in or near a mining district you might say to yourselves, 'This is an ugly place; I should not like to live in it.' You see only the outside of things; inside many of the houses there are fathers and mothers who love their boys and girls so dearly that when these grow up and go out into the world they think of their homes as being like what they hope heaven will be. I am reminded of one such home. There were seven boys and one girl in it, so you may be sure it was very lively. The father was a very hard-working man; he had a baker's shop; and the mother so loved him and her boys and her one girl that she was happiest of all when she was working hard to help him in his business and trying to save money so that her youngest boy, who was born in 1811, might be sent to college. She had great ambitions for Jamie, as he was called, a laddie with a bright eye, a towsy head, and a good scholar. The name of the town in which Jamie lived was Bathgate. Being within driving distance of Edinburgh his father took him there sometimes. That grand old city can give boys and girls not merely a great deal to see and talk about afterwards, but something to think about as well. Jamie loved going there, but, unfortunately, such long drives were not of very frequent occurrence. There were, however, certain places near Bathgate that attracted him. One was an old churchyard. The curious inscriptions on some of the tombstones fascinated him; he read them over and over again—rather a gloomy amuse-

ment, you think. But the gloom of it did not affect Jamie. The sight of the Pentland Hills was a tonic to him morning, noon, and night. And then he had only to look up at the sky, especially on summer evenings, to begin to dream of glorious things that were beyond his comprehension.

When Jamie was at school he used to come home for a forenoon 'piece.' When he did not find his mother in the shop he would creep softly into the house and peep into her bedroom; he knew she would be there praying, all by herself. The first time he saw her on her knees he felt afraid; he thought she must be weeping, but when he sidled up to her it was to receive a kiss that sent him away smiling.

That dear mother died when her youngest boy was nine years old. The duty of taking care of him then fell upon his sister Mary. Let me tell you how he got on.

Through the wise upbringing of his sister, and the help of other members of the family, James succeeded in getting to Edinburgh University. But it was not till he became a medical student that he began to show what his home had done for him. He was not content with merely scraping through his classes. His experience of the operating theatre made him realize what big operations meant to the people who had to bear them, for there was no chloroform used then. The thought of that was constantly in his mind. Even when he had become a doctor with a practice that meant very hard work he was constantly putting the question to himself, 'How can I help to make the suffering in this world even a little bit less?' Through his own ability and exertions he was appointed a University lecturer, and later a Professor. And how the students crowded to hear his lectures! They recognized in Dr. James Simpson a man who had thought out things for himself and was not afraid to give expression to his honest convictions.

You would like to know how he looked, would you not? When he was a wee fellow, an old woman in his native town described him as a 'bonnie bairn, wi' rosy cheek and dimpled mou'.' When a Professor, visitors to Edinburgh who met him on the street would ask, 'Who is that remarkable man?' He was not tall but broad. He had bushy, dark hair, a broad forehead, a firm mouth, and bright eyes. His eyes were more than merely bright; they revealed the tenderness of his heart. That tenderness came out in his treatment of sick little children. If they came to his house sobbing because they were to be examined by the great doctor, they loved him whenever he spoke. An old patient of his could tell how the Professor watched her boy amusing himself playing cards, and how with seeming enjoyment he sat down to play a game with him; and as later he hurried downstairs to leave, he gave a few directions to the mother, for all the time he had been intent on the game he had been watching his small patient.

The time came, however, when not merely little children loved him. The great world blessed him. Although Dr. James Simpson did not discover chloroform he found out that it could be used safely at all sorts of operations. He considered no trouble too great if it helped to make him certain of its efficacy, and he found other two doctors—friends of his own—who were willing to join in experiments that really meant risking their lives. One evening they each took a sniff, and in a moment or two the three of them were under the table unconscious. It was a great day in the doctor's house when he was able to tell of his first successful operation under chloroform. No wonder. Think what it must have meant for patients to have to bear the pain inflicted by the surgeon's knife, and not only that, but in many cases the agony of seeing him use it. Nervous people sometimes died from sheer terror. Professor Simpson had his mind set on putting an end to the tragedies that went on day after day in the infirmaries, and in people's homes, and because of what he achieved his name will go down to posterity as one who brought a great blessing to suffering men and women, as well as little children.

He was created a Baronet, but the honour brought sorrow in its train. Within a few weeks he lost a beloved son and daughter. That made him sad, but it did not take away his gentleness. Even when overwork had brought on an illness from which he never recovered, no amount of suffering dulled his interest in his one little girl and her lessons. She tells how she used to learn them in his sick-room, and how she could recall that while he did not speak much, in a very few words he expressed something that meant a world of interest and love.

Lying in wait for the end, it was as if he became a little child once more. He had simple stories read to him, and hymns such as you boys and girls love. 'In Emmanuel's Land' was one of his

favourite hymns. In thought he was often back in the old home at Bathgate. 'Sandy, Sandy,' he murmured to his oldest brother, who sat tending him on the last night of his life. Sandy had been a good friend to him all his life. He was buried at Edinburgh in Warriston Cemetery. Above his grave is the tombstone he had erected when sorrow first entered his Edinburgh home. On it is carved a butterfly, and underneath that, 'Nevertheless I live'; for Sir James Simpson believed that the Lord Jesus Christ had abolished death. Speaking shortly before his death to his nephew, his brother Sandy's youngest boy, he said, 'I have unshaken confidence in Jesus only.'

'What do you consider was the greatest discovery you ever made?' an interviewer once asked him. 'That I have a Saviour,' was his answer.

The great man was as a little child.

II.

Wandering Stars.

'Wandering stars.'—Jude [13].

If you have been out on a dark night, especially about the month of November, you may have seen what looked rather like a rocket, or a series of rockets, falling from the sky. There was a flash and a long stream of light behind it, and almost before you could say, 'Look!' it had vanished into darkness again.

People usually call these flashes in the darkness 'falling stars,' but they are not really stars at all. That name was given to them at a time when their origin and history was unknown. The earth in its journey through space meets small portions of matter. Now you know that the earth has a tremendous *pulling* power. That is the reason why, if you jump down off a high wall, you don't fly up into the air. And so when our world in its journey round the sun comes into the neighbourhood of any of these small portions of matter it pulls them towards itself. Before they meet the earth they are quite cold and invisible, but when they first enter the atmosphere which surrounds the earth they travel at the rate of from ten to forty-five miles in a second, and the speed at which they travel makes them extremely hot and brilliant.

By far the greater number of these meteors are turned into gas before they reach the surface of the globe, but a very few are broken up and descend in the form of meteoric stones or 'meteorites,' as they are called. If you visit a good museum you may see some of these meteorites. They look like a bit of rock with a sort of crust over the top. They are usually black in colour and are largely composed of iron. Most of them are covered with little indentations which look rather like thumb-marks. The largest meteorite ever found was discovered in Mexico. It was about thirteen feet long, six feet broad, and five feet thick, and it weighed about fifty tons. Another very large one was brought from Greenland by Peary in 1894. It weighed thirty-six and a half tons, but must have been larger originally, as the Eskimo had chipped away fragments to make weapons. You must not think, however, that meteorites are all large and heavy. The majority are quite tiny; many do not weigh an ounce, and I dare say there are thousands upon thousands so tiny that they have never been found at all.

Now perhaps you will wonder where these meteors come from. How did they happen to get into space, and how did they manage to get in our way? Well, you have all heard of comets, and you know that comets are heavenly bodies, very hot and bright, which wander through the heavens. Some of these comets go round the sun just as we do, others go round it once and then seem to disappear for ever. Now when a comet is near the sun it has a tail which looks very much like fiery hair streaming out from it. This tail is formed by the sun's pushing off from the comet some of the lighter matter of which it is composed. Sometimes the tail breaks off altogether, and the matter of which it is composed cools down and becomes solid. These solid bodies get left behind, but they still follow the path where the comet has been. Some day the earth crosses that path and comes in contact with these bodies, and so we have a fall of meteors.

Now, boys and girls, God sent you into this world to shine, but He meant you to be something better than a meteor. Don't be one of the people who are too brilliant to do steady work and whose light is certain to go out. Don't be one of those who are fair and pleasant on the outside, but who can't be relied upon. Do your duty faithfully and thoroughly. Never mind how slow you are, or how humble. Shine with your own little steady light. Be a fixed star, sure and steadfast. Someone will be the brighter for your shining.

III.

Love's Gift.

'She hath done what she could.'—Mk 14^8.

To-day I am not going to give you a text, but I am going to tell you three stories, and after you have heard them I am going to ask you to find the text yourselves.

The first is a story that happened a year or two ago. It happened at Charing Cross Station in London.

One cold spring day a train of wounded was arriving from France, and a crowd gathered to watch the soldiers being helped to the ambulances. In one ambulance four badly wounded men were tenderly laid. They were covered with warm wraps, and someone in the crowd placed on the top of these a few golden daffodils. A little ragged, barefoot newsboy, who had wormed his way to the front of the crowd, as little boys usually do, ran forward as the ambulance moved off, and beside the flowers threw four copies of his evening paper. Then he dived hastily into the mass of onlookers and disappeared from view. But not a few people in that crowd said to themselves our text.

The second story happened centuries ago. In fact, it comes to us from what people call the Middle Ages.

In those days there lived in France a certain poor juggler who went from town to town, from village to village, and earned his living by doing various tricks. He would spread on the ground a piece of carpet to represent a platform, then he would make a little speech, and then he would do marvellous balancing feats with a tin plate, some knives, and six copper balls.

Now it chanced one day that the poor juggler fell in with a worthy monk, and the monk told the juggler about Jesus Christ and how he and his brother monks lived only to praise and serve Him. As the juggler listened he felt that he also would fain serve the Christ, so he went with the monk to the monastery, donned a friar's robe and hood, and became a brother. They gave him the name of Brother Amicus, which just means 'friend.'

Now, as time passed, one thing greatly grieved Brother Amicus. It was this—all the brothers were able to do something to the praise and glory of God. One could write beautiful thoughts, another could paint exquisite letters on vellum, a third could sing like an angel, and a fourth could carve lovely white images of Christ. All could do something—all except Brother Amicus.

Then one day he heard our text, and an idea came to him, and as he thought of it his face, which had been sad, shone with happiness. Day after day it glowed, till the other monks could not help but notice it. They noticed, too, that he spent much of his time in the chapel of the monastery. At last they set themselves to watch, and what do you think they saw? This: Brother Amicus with his juggler's dress and his old piece of carpet, and his plate and knives and balls juggling more wonderfully than he had ever juggled to man, in front of the great white statue of Christ. The balls tossed and the knives flashed, and Amicus bent and twisted himself till beads of perspiration stood out on his brow.

The watching monks were horror-stricken, and would have rushed forward to stop such an exhibition in the holy place, but the story tells that just as they were going to do so the figure of Christ stooped forward and gently wiped the perspiration from the juggler's brow. Christ had seen only the yearning love in the heart of His humble servant.

The third story is a story that happened nineteen hundred years ago.

The people of a certain little Eastern village had made a feast in honour of a great Physician who was passing through their village. They had made the feast to show their gratitude to the great Healer for the many wonderful things He had done in their midst. He had come to their village many times, and every time He had come He had given them cause to bless Him. But this feast was to celebrate a specially wonderful deed of His. Shortly before this, one of the chief men of the village, an intimate friend of the Physician, had fallen ill. They had sent urgent messages to the Healer that His friend was at death's door, but ere He had arrived the sick man was dead. He was even buried. Then the Physician had worked a miracle more miraculous than any He had worked before. He had gone to the grave of the dead man, and at His call the dead man had come forth from the tomb restored to life and health. No wonder that the village wanted to honour such a Healer!

The feast was held in the house of another patient of the great Physician—one Simon, whom

He had cured of leprosy. Everybody was vying with everybody else to show the Miracle-Worker how grateful they were for His kindness. It was a splendid feast. The man who had been brought back from the dead was there. So was his elder sister. She was helping to serve at table. But his younger sister did not come into the room till the middle of the meal, and when she came in she did what we in this country would consider a very strange thing. She walked over to the couch on which the great Physician reclined (for in these days they did not sit up at table as we do), and taking from the folds of her dress a beautiful flask of costly perfume, she broke it and poured the perfume on the head and feet of Him who had given her back her brother. And so sweet was the perfume that the whole house was filled with the odour.

Now anointing with perfume was supposed to be a very special way of showing homage and honour in the East, but so costly was this perfume that some of the guests shook their heads and said to each other, 'What a waste! Just think what a lot of money that flask would have brought had it been sold! Why, it would have bought a dinner for hundreds of poor people!'

But the great Physician Himself did not say 'What a waste!' He saw the love that lay behind the gift. He saw that the woman wished to give Him the best she had to offer. So when the people murmured He rebuked them and said—the words of our text.

For this third story is a Bible story, dear children, and you will find it told in three of the books of the New Testament—Matthew, Mark, and John. These all tell the same story, but each gives us a little bit of information that the others leave out. It is Mark only who gives us the sentence that fits our other two stories of to-day.

Do you think you can find that sentence? It consists of six words. Two of them are three letters long, three are four letters long, and the longest has only five letters. I think almost the tiniest child here could read that sentence.

Look for it, boys and girls, and when you have found it think over it well and say to yourselves, 'I should like Jesus to say that of me.' I, too, should like Him to say it of each of you. But remember that you don't need to do any very brilliant or any very wonderful thing to win that reward. You merely need to do—but there!—I was almost giving away the text!

The Christian Year.

Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Collective Selfishness.

'Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil.'—Ex 23^2.

It has been said that collective selfishness is only individual selfishness writ large. It is this; but it is also worse than this. One knows from experience that men who are unselfish in private life, and who as individuals are ready to sacrifice themselves freely to their country or to some great cause, are apt to become selfish when they herd together and begin to work for common ends.

1. For this there are two reasons. The first is that the sense of comradeship, of mutual obligation, of working with others for a common end, blinds a man to the fact that if that end is a selfish one he is really working for his own interests. In the late war individual citizens vied with one another in patriotic devotion and self-sacrifice; but when they came together in communities of various kinds—political parties, trade unions, federations of employers, joint-stock companies, and the like—they were apt to think more of the welfare of their respective communities than of the safety of their country, even in the supreme crisis of her life. Could anything, for example, be stronger than the contrast between the heroism and self-devotion of the miners who fought—in their hundreds of thousands—for their country and the reckless selfishness of the sectional strikes of miners which again and again restricted the output of coal when the Nation's need of it, both for itself and for its Allies, was most urgent? So far, indeed, are men from realizing the essential immorality of collective selfishness, that they accept it as inevitable if they do not actually count it a virtue. The economic aspect of social problems is apt to overshadow the ethical; and men who would appeal to high motives if they were addressing themselves to individuals will come down to an altogether lower level when they are dealing with communities or classes. 'The most disquieting feature,' says a writer in the *Spectator*, 'in what is loosely called the democratic advent is that no one, I care not who, ever speaks to the working classes (as such) in the name of honour or duty or unselfishness, or appeals to anything but self-interest.'

2. The second reason why men are apt to be more selfish collectively than individually is that the selfishness of a community tends to react

upon the characters of its members and infect them with its own poison. In pre-war Germany, for example, the State, which was on principle self-centred, aggressive, rapacious, and indifferent to the claims of Humanity, infected the citizens with its own selfishness and went far towards materializing their aims and demoralizing their lives. And it was Germany, the most selfish of all nations, which set the world on fire. Let her fate be our warning. If peace is to prevail on earth, each nation in turn must aim, not only at aggrandizing itself and enriching its people, but also and above all at playing a worthy part in the Human Commonwealth, both by working for the establishment of international law and order, and by training its people for citizenship in the greatest of all earthly communities.[1]

Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity.

The Offices.

'Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession.'—He 3^{1}.

This is Christ. What does the name 'Christ' mean? We call Him Christ, and so express our belief that He is the Messiah expected by the Jews and fulfilling all that the Name indicated. There can be no doubt of this. The author of *Ecce Homo* writes: 'That Christ did Himself claim Messiahship cannot reasonably be doubted. His death is explicable on no other supposition. On this point assuredly His enemies and followers were agreed.' And that the Messiah was to be Prophet, Priest, and King is also clear. Now Christ accepted that threefold Ministry and so justified His Name.

1. He came amongst men as Prophet. Centuries before His advent it had been promised that God would raise up 'a prophet like unto Moses,' and this prophet was expected when He came. After the miraculous feeding of the five thousand the people said, 'This really must be the prophet who should come into the world' (Jn 6^{14}). And again when He entered Jerusalem for the last time the crowds that filled the streets answered the questioners who asked, 'Who is this?' with the words, 'This is the Prophet, Jesus of Nazareth of Galilee' (Mt 21^{11}). And in fulfilling this office He not only predicted future events such as St. Peter's fall, the destruction of Jerusalem, the success of His own Kingdom, of which there was no sign when He first laid bare its secrets; but He also helped men to realize the Father's love, the deep interest He had in the smallest of His creatures—not one of the sparrows perished without His knowledge—as well as in the great laws on which that Kingdom was based. He also explained its perils as well as its rewards and joys. In endless stories that attracted His hearers He made clear to all who desired to learn, the influence and expansion, the inclusiveness as well as the exclusiveness of the Realm He was bringing in. So He was the greatest of Prophets. Now it is this character that men understand best and appreciate most readily. It is as Prophet and Teacher that Jesus is most widely known.

2. But the Messiah was also to be Priest. This office is more difficult to understand. It embraces characteristics which are not felt to be so necessary. The word Priest has a disagreeable sound. It suggests mysterious, hidden, unintelligible processes with practices connected with superstitious rites. It has been discredited amongst Christian as well as Pagan peoples. The plain man dislikes it. And yet it expresses a truth which an unprejudiced and careful scholar, Dr. Milligan, describes as Christ's distinguishing characteristic. 'We may often think of the exalted Redeemer as Prophet and King. We have mainly to think of Him as Priest, as well as Prophet.' The fact that it was to be a Priesthood after the order of Melchizedek makes no difference as to the reality. That order did not annul its essential characteristics. Whether of Levi or of Melchizedek a Priest was a Priest in all that belonged to Priesthood. This the Epistle to the Hebrews makes plain.

If it be asked when He became Priest, it seems clear that as Eternal Son He became Priest when He became Man, and that His Priesthood was acclaimed as His Baptism when the voice from heaven was heard saying, 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.' For that word was heard after that He had as Priest made confession of the world's sin in the waters of Jordan, such confession being a sacerdotal act. It is a mistake to confine our Lord's priestly work to that on the Cross and the perpetual Intercession that followed after. The confession of the sins of others and their absolution were the acts of a Priest. And not once but often, as in the Lord's Prayer, He made mention of men's sins before His Father, and not once but often He absolved

[1] E. Holmes, *The Cosmic Commonwealth*.

sinners as the Son of Man—*i.e.* as the Head of Humanity. Absolution was a bold act and one that excited much indignation, seeming to be blasphemy to those who did not know His relation to God and Man. And it can be explained only on the ground that He knew Himself to be a Priest of the Most High God, though not after the Order of Aaron. So too His many acts of blessing the children, the bread and fish, and specially the bread and wine, gave a sacerdotal expression to His life which must have surprised many who looked upon Him only as a great Teacher. And these priestly actions were all summed up in the great sacrificial act on the Cross when He offered up Himself as a 'full, perfect, sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,' and at His Ascension took this offering into the Holiest of Holies, where it is for ever pleaded before the Throne of the Father. The more closely our Lord's life is looked at in the light of the New Testament, especially that which falls upon it from the writings of St. John and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, the more clearly does it appear that priesthood is its distinguishing characteristic.

3. And His Kingship flows out of it. 'In the order of thought our Lord is Priest in Heaven before He is Prophet or King. His prophetical and kingly offices are but the further issues of what He accomplishes as Priest.' And what is His Sovereignty? 'Royalty with the Jews was not simply an elevation in rank, dignity, and splendour,' writes Dr. Milligan. 'It was power—power to protect friends and overthrow enemies.' This was abundantly manifested in the life of Christ. The storm threatened to engulf His disciples, but He spake the word and there was a great calm. The demoniacs were a terror to the neighbourhood of Gadara, and He cast them forth. The Jewish soldiery that arrested Him would have laid hands on His followers, but He forbade them. Multitudes were faint with hunger, and He miraculously fed them. Again and again the expression of His Majesty was sufficient to silence and cow His adversaries. But His sovereignty differed from that of the world in its selfishness. Never was it exercised for its own prestige or dignity, never to excite worship or even recognition: He disclaimed all that. Nay, further, He distinguished between His own sovereignty and that of the world (Lk 22^{25}). The kings of the Gentiles exercised authority and their rulers took the name of Benefactor, but it was not to be so with Christ's Divine Sovereignty. That meant work for others, the work of bearing testimony to the truth. That was the Kingship He claimed (see Jn 18^{37}). He had immense resources, legions of angels were ever at His command, but only for the benefit of others were they ever used in the countless healings and miracles of which He was the Author. And when He was last seen He claimed power over all things in heaven and earth, but again not for His personal aggrandisement, but only with a view to strengthening their faith in His ability to help them at all times even to the end of the world.

Such in barest outline was the Christ, a Prophet speaking as never man spake, a Priest fulfilling sacerdotal functions that were never so fulfilled before, and a King dispensing royal favours and powers as no monarch could do.[1]

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Power of the Cross.

'It is the power of God unto salvation.'—Ro 1^{16}.

If a man comes to the cross with no theological views at all, the story of that suffering gift of life for man speaks with immediate and powerful authenticity. It renews a man's belief in love. It creates a new conception of the length to which selfless devotion will go. It reaches for the best there is in a man, and by a noble contagion calls to his own capacity for devotion to a cause, to a friend, to righteousness in the world. There is creative energy in the very story. The sun shines through it upon a new and more noble world. A world where anybody could think of such a story is a new sort of world in which to live.

1. If a man believes that God Himself in His own Son suffered upon the cross, a new wealth of meaning emerges. He never knew God before. Now he has seen God in action. Now he has seen God in the torturing pain of a great sacrifice. Now he has seen how much God loves the men whom He has made. And the whole world is full of God as he turns from the cross where God's own Son has died to the world in which

[1] G. H. S. Walpole, *Prophets and Priests*.

he must live. Everything has a new sort of foundation. With this sort of God a man can think different thoughts. With this sort of God a man can speak different words. With this sort of God a man can do different deeds. God Himself takes an absolutely new place in the strategies of human life after He has been seen in the cross.

2. If a man believes that the cross speaks a message about God's character as well as a message about God's love, other meanings stand forth, for now Calvary tells the story of how much God hates sin as well as the story of how much God loves the man who has sinned. And so it comes to pass that the conscience is made all over again in the fires of that great sacrifice. The cross becomes a standard as well as an inspiration. Eyes which have seen the cross cannot see other things. And that one deed makes some other deeds impossible for those who understand its message to the conscience of man. The test of the cross becomes the basis of a new ethic. And the achievement of the cross becomes the conserver of the moral life of a man as well as the creator of a new and deeper morality.

3. If a man believes that God Himself in the hour when He bent His life to the passionate pain of the cross wrought in such deep and masterful ethical and spiritual fashion that some things became possible for him which were not possible before, the cross becomes a basis for such a venture of a deed of trust as rests all a man's past and present and future upon the Saviour who wrought that great achievement. And the peace which passeth all understanding flows into the life of the man who makes the great commitment and takes the great adventure. The doors are opened Godward in a completely new fashion, and fellowship with God comes to have a new meaning in the soul of man.

4. If one believes that Calvary sets forth a principle as well as is the embodiment of an achievement, then he is gladly committed to the perpetuation of the spirit of the cross in the world. And the way of sacrifice is glorified with the light which falls from Calvary as men walk through the world, not counting their lives dear unto themselves, but giving with boundless generosity of their personal powers for the service of men. And when the great and terrible demand for the surrender of life itself comes, as it came to many in the Great War, there comes with the demand a knowledge that everything is different because of the Great Volunteer who gave Himself so long ago.

5. If a man believes in the standard of human values set by such a divine sacrifice as that expressed on the cross, he finds himself standing before wide-open doors which look out upon a larger and fuller life than this world knows. Only immortal spirits would be worth such a sacrifice. Only immortal spirits could justify such suffering pain. The cross as the deed of the Son of God lifts man out of time and takes him into eternity.

So it comes to pass that, whatever a man's beliefs, the cross has a message for him. And as he follows the way it points out to him, it speaks a fuller and fuller message, until at last the vistas widen and he sees that only immortality can realize the implications of the cross. 'By this sign conquer!'[1]

Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity.

The Presence.

'The dayspring from on high hath visited us.'—Lk 1^{78}.

What does this presence of a personal God do for us?

1. In the first place, companionship is always available, and that the companionship of Him who alone can always get right alongside of us, because He can read our thoughts from within. All hitches, uncertainties, and difficulties are thus provided for in advance: He who gives the work is always beside the worker. The servant of God is thus like Solomon's servants, whom the Queen of Sheba congratulated. 'Happy are thy men, happy are these thy servants, which *stand continually before thee, and that hear thy voice.*'[2] Contrast the farm-slaves on the vast estates of some Roman noble in Augustus' reign. They were only a superior form of cattle, unknown (except perhaps in the form of a rough estimate of how many he had) to the far-away master of whom, very likely, they knew only the name. Yet there are modern would-be substitutes for Christianity which, prompted by doubt of a Personal God, are obliged to reduce men again to that state—as when they bid a man work and suffer for, say, the good of 'humanity' or the prosperity of a future age. How much better the terms of service for those whose Master not only says, 'I

[1] L. H. Hough, *The Eyes of Faith*.
[2] 1 K 10^{8}.

have called you *friends*,' but is also always by His servants' side.

2. Secondly, companionship leads to assistance. There is in St. Mark 6, in the story of the storm on the lake which followed the Feeding of the Five Thousand, a good illustration of the helpful Presence of Christ in His servants' difficulties, with also a hint of how we may so easily miss His help. He was alone on the mountain praying: they were, according to St. Mark, 'in the midst of the sea,' according to St. John, 'twenty-five or thirty furlongs from land.' It was very late in the evening: and there is next to no twilight in those lands. Yet, we are told, His eye was on them: not on the boat—a speck, at best, in the gloom—but on them. 'When He saw them *tortured* in their rowing' is the force of Greek: His sympathy put Him, in effect, by their side. But it was not till 'about the fourth watch' that He actually approached them, 'walking on the sea.' Why the delay? Was He waiting for them to think of *Him*, and even wish, if they had not the faith to pray, for His presence? The next words suggest as much: 'He was prepared to go right past them'—not, surely, in callousness, when He had already gone so far to save them, but because *even still* they were trying to save themselves and forgetting Him. Then, when they did see Him, their first emotion was fear, and they jumped to the conclusion that He must be a ghost. But at least He had now caught their attention, and so was able to put Himself in touch: to 'speak with them, and say to them, Cheer up, it is I. Don't be frightened.' Then, says St. John's version, 'they *became willing* to receive Him into the ship, and *immediately* the ship was at the land whither they went.' But the help might have been theirs as soon as the difficulties began. Is that perhaps a picture of how we also try to 'worry through' by ourselves, without calling in the help of His Presence? And yet there He is still, looking out into our present stormy night of the world, and seeing in the midst of the trouble and despair not merely a Church, a community, a cause, a household, but your individual life and mine—even to the expression on our faces, and the secret torture, perhaps, in our hearts. And, seeing, His one desire is to help—if we will allow Him. All that is part of what comes from serving 'before the face' of One whose back is never turned upon us.

3. And, thirdly, His Presence spells incentive. Not the incentive (save where our slackness needs it) applied by the master's eye fixed upon the schoolboy dawdling over his work, but the spur which the presence of one we love and look up to gives; supplying us at once with a motive for putting out our best efforts and also with a pleasant exhilaration which takes us straight to 'the top of our form.' How much is added to the possibility of making our service perfect by all that flows from this condition of service 'before His face'![1]

[1] E. A. Burroughs, *The Way of Peace*.

Fellowship in Relation to Christian Service.[1]

By the Reverend H. J. Wotherspoon, D.D., Edinburgh.

One finds that many are speaking just now of fellowship, but that no one defines it. Mr. Clutton-Brock has told us that the Kingdom of Heaven implies a doctrine of fellowship 'which we have enjoyed with our emotions, but have never grasped with our intelligence.' And that is probably true. Most who speak of fellowship seem to have in mind social intercourse and what one has called 'little evenings.' Now social intercourse is an excellent thing, and little evenings may be pleasant; but neither can be thought precisely or adequately to satisfy what Mr. Clutton-Brock refers to as a doctrine implied by the Kingdom of Heaven. Or, we have references to 'the comradeship of the trenches' and a desire for its continuance here at home in the form of 'fellowship'; and one feels that there we are nearer to a doctrine of the Kingdom—for in the trenches men were united in a cause, and had all things in common, bore one another's burdens, and even laid down life for one another; yet we have hardly in seeing this grasped the doctrine with our intelligence; we have only an illustration, casting light, certainly, on what we appreciate with our emotions; but we are no nearer to a defini-

[1] An address delivered at Aberdeen, September 19, 1919.

tion, or even to a description. Fellowship is something more than social amenity, and more even than comradeship.

Mr. Brock says that our Lord 'talked of it constantly'[1]—I am not sure what he has in mind in saying so; I do not recall any direct mention of the subject in the Gospels: but the Apostolic writers do write frequently of it, and if we can grasp with our intelligence their conception, we are probably on right lines towards a theory of the matter. Their word[2] for the thing we render in our Versions 'communion' or else 'fellowship'; and the word seems to imply, perhaps always, community in some possession. There are two who share, and there is invariably a third term, the thing shared: explicitly or implicitly fellowship is *in* something; and the resulting state of matters—a consciousness of union or bond in the participation—is *κοινωνία*. Any theory of fellowship which can be grasped with the intelligence will evidently depend on our understanding of what the third term, the thing had in common, is taken to be.

Thus, *e.g.*, fellowship may be based on a sharing in material things. St. Paul bids the disciple communicate with his teacher in all goods; he speaks of being willing to communicate; the writer to the Hebrews tells us not to be forgetful to do good and to communicate.[3] The fellowship there is in the substance of the givers.

Applied to spiritual things the same usage seems to hold: under the word there is always the idea of a third something in which the relation stands. At the Lord's Table there is a sharing of the Body and of the Blood of Christ. In the temple feasts of paganism there was a sharing with the demon in his altar and in the meals. The Corinthians are called into a partnership in Christ with their fellow-believers. St. Paul had a sharing in the gospel with the Philippians, and with Philemon in his faith. The fellowship in each case subsisted in these common terms.

Then there is also an absolute use of the word, as we have it, *e.g.*, in Acts, when the disciples are said to have 'persevered in the instruction of the Apostles and in the fellowship'—or in St. John's First Epistle, when he speaks of 'our fellowship,' 'your fellowship,'—with Apostles, with God, with Christ, with one another. But the idea of a something shared is obviously present; with St. Luke it is the teaching of Apostles, given and received, which creates the fellowship—with St. John it is the Light, in which man may have communion with God, and may be at one with his brother believer.

The mere sharing,[4] however, is not the fellowship: the fellowship is rather a result of the sharing, a relation of mind to mind and self to self, which comes of having in common and of recognizing the community. Still less is fellowship in the scriptural sense equivalent to 'communion' in the ecclesiastical sense, as when we speak of being in fellowship with the Church, or of persons or bodies being in communion with one another—a relation which may exist where there is little *κοινωνία*. In so far as that formal conception may have entered the mind of the Apostolic age, it was probably otherwise expressed.[5]

Fellowship is, I think, a conscious mutual understanding and interest in the enjoyment of the same position or of the same possession. I say 'enjoyment': because the word is almost always used with a good connotation; St. John, indeed, speaks of communion in affliction, but even then for its mitigation. Fellowship may exist between two or among many; and when it exists, it constitutes a tie, more or less close in measure as the subject of communion is in the estimation of each more or less important or intrinsically precious. We may thus have fellowship in things external and objective, as husband and wife have in their children, or kindred in the bond of blood, or as members of a state have in its history and prosperity. The deeper fellowship is when the common term is subjective, and stands in possession of the same values, the same conception of the good, the true, the beautiful. It must always mean much to me if my fellow-man can 'see the invisible' as I see it, can believe as I believe, admires what seems to me to be right, and enjoys what seems to me to be lovely. I hail his agreement; it confirms me in my own positions; it gives substance to my convictions and appreciations. No man is certain of the worth of

[1] *What is the Kingdom of Heaven?* ch. iv. 'Politics.'

[2] *κοινωνία*.

[3] Gal 6^{6}, 1 Ti 6^{18}, He 13^{16}. Other passages are Ph $4^{14.\ 15}$, all in the verbal form.

[4] *μετόχη*, found with *κοινωνία* (2 Co 4^{16}); *μετέχομεν* with *κοινωνία* (1 Co $10^{16.\ 17}$). Cf. He 2^{14}.

[5] There is an approach to it, but in an unfavourable sense, in the use of *συναναμίγνυσθαι* (1 Co $5^{9.\ 11}$ and 2 Th 3^{14}).

his beliefs or even of the validity of his moral judgments, so long as they are only his; he does not know whether he is misled by predilection, mocked by his imagination, or deceived by his desire to find one thing right, another true, a third thing admirable. The whole position is changed for him, if he discovers that he is not solitary in what has seemed to him to be perception. Another man has seen the same—it then exists. This other also approves what seems to me to be just; we have the same values together, he and I: and I am justified in my estimate of them. I find in him my own mind, my own conscience, my own sense of what is fair and excellent; and he finds his in me. I verify from him my thought, my sense of duty, my joy in what is lovely—I gain them from him; and he in turn is enriched by my coincidence with him. We establish one another, we can converse, we can think together, act together; and still be glad in one another. This in its measure is fellowship.

Fellowship, however, attains its highest significance when it rises to be communion in faith, and the relation shared is the relation to God. For this matters most. The principal thing is one's belief as to God, and one's contentment with God. That is happiness or gloom; that is peace or foreboding; that is acceptance of the lot, or it is rebellion. All that the world and my own existence may mean to me is determined by this. And it is purely matter of faith. The need of fellowship arises from this subjectivity of spiritual experience and from its inevitable solitude. The world may be read in so many ways, and to so different inference; it is everything to be confirmed in my own reading of it. I am thus intensely drawn to the fellow-soul which discerns the unseen with the same eyes as myself. I need him as I need no other. This partnership of faith is precious; the objectivity of my spiritual life depends upon it. And what my brother can in this do for me, clothing my faith with substance, I in turn can do for him: he comes to me with the same craving and he finds in me the same joy. Between two men, on the other hand, one of whom sees God and the other does not, or who see God differently, there lie gulfs which neither, if he would, can cross: they are in different worlds; their sympathy with one another can be but shallow; their thought diverges as soon as it penetrates to anything that really counts. Only men who see alike in the great matters are capable of more than superficial fellowship.

But more than that: faith is law. Every principle of conduct runs down for root into belief —and into *this* belief, of what God means and is. Two cannot walk together unless they are agreed, at least so far. There is no agreement in values, unless there is agreement in God—life means a different thing to men of differing faith.

And all that becomes poignant when the question is of a wild and excessive belief such as that of the unreduced Christianity. Not every man says in the Spirit and with full intention 'Jesus is Lord.' It is a tremendous thing to accept the Incarnation, and it has serious consequences in the personal sphere. The venture of such faith is great, and calls for ventures in practice which no man makes lightly. Here fellowship counts. One wonders whether either the Christian affirmation, or the stride out into the actually Christian method of life is possible without its support. One tries to conceive a man brought *alone* to the point of conviction at which he feels constrained to say 'Jesus is God': will he not look round him to see if there is any other who is driven to the same astounding conclusion? What will it not mean to him to discover that he is not alone, but is in the midst of a company whom no man can number, who have been forced to say, as he desires to say, 'God of God, Light of Light, Very God of very God'? Apprehending the fellowship, he may dare the confession. Who can measure the worth to him of this fellowship and its joy, which has brought such faith within his soul's compassing? Or, when he encounters the calling which follows belief, meets the concrete requirement, and doubts of himself 'whether he is able'—and finds that he has only to tread a beaten track, that others attempt the same, and that he marches in rank with faithful men, who solve with him the desperate problem? With them he will not shrink from the attempt. That is fellowship—the comfort and support of those who share with us the final motives, and side by side with us search out the path of life.

It seems, then, as though Christian fellowship were radically a fellowship in truth, and arises out of community in faith; as Augustine says, *ubi est fides sancta, ibi est sancta communio.* St. John [1] traces its ground and genesis: (1) The Apostles

[1] Jn 1^{3-7}.

declare what they have seen and heard, in order that those who hear and believe may be in fellowship with them, as their fellowship is with God; the result being fulness of joy; (2) the message of Apostles is that God is Light, and the fellowship becomes a walking together in the light, fellowship being with God and with one another; and (3) in this fellowship there comes a cleansing; none of us can be perfected alone, the Christian graces being social graces and the Christian conscience a social conscience which implies God and the brother, God and the world, with a right relation to both: the fulfilling of the law is love. This, I think, is what Mr. Clutton-Brock has in view, when he says that we cannot be saved individually, but only by sharing in the Kingdom of God.

Community of faith is not the whole of fellowship; it is rather the root and condition of fellowship as that may develop in the intercourse of spirit, the pursuit of common inquiry, common testimony, common aims and shared effort, which community of belief induces in the deep and glad friendship which is attainable when life has one foundation and effort has the same inspiration and the same goal. Fellowship opens out in many lines; but all radiate from one root—they are all fellowship in the truth. For men may work side by side and for the same result, but have no fellowship, unless motive and principle unite them in the work. Coalition unfortunately is not fellowship. They may kneel side by side in prayer and have no fellowship, unless the object of worship is similarly conceived and they come to God by the same way and imagine the same answers to supplication.

The possible scope of fellowship (in the sense which matters) seems therefore to be determined by degree of coincidence in faith. One may make it more extensive by basing it on slighter agreement—that is to say, by more or less evacuating the content of that third term, the thing in which there is to be community. Or one may extend its area by obtaining approximation to agreement in belief. No third way is apparent. There may be superficial fellowship with many, or deep fellowship with fewer. Fellowship is a thing of degree. It has, for example, a certain basis in our common humanity—*Homo sum*, and so forth. Or there may be, and there is, fellowship in simple Theism—one is nearer in heart to a Jew or a Mohammedan than one can be to a Buddhist or a Confucian. There is a narrower fellowship of all who recognize (let us say) the 'uniqueness' of Jesus: it includes not so many, but it is worth more. With every step towards fulness of assertion, you contract your circle, but the community of heart within it grows richer in its values. When you have finally dared the Catholic Confession of the Word made Flesh and have obtained of God to acknowledge the Holy Eternal and Undivided Trinity, you have reached a fellowship which consciously and in the certainty of the Christian experience is of a new and supernatural kind, and is on a new plane. In reaching it, you have sacrificed nothing of such companionship of soul as you may have found in the approaches and border lands of faith—that you still have for what it is worth: but these slighter participations have passed out of the comparison—they have no relevant significance. Here 'joy is full'—the disciples have all things common: one body, one spirit, one hope, one calling, one Lord, one faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all.

It follows that fellowship is not something that one practises, but something that one has. It exists or it does not exist. Two men either have faith in common, or they have not. If they have, they are in fellowship, and nothing can prevent it. Its manifestation may, or may not, be cultivated, and the intercourse which it makes possible may or may not be enjoyed—but it is there independently of manifestation or of fruition. On the other hand, if its ground does not exist in the common belief, conscience, and experience, it can be created only by attainment to them. Concatenation in external systems does not produce fellowship. Men come into fellowship as they come to find the same things in God and in Christ, and together to see the Kingdom of God in the Holy Ghost—that it is justice and peace and joy.

In relation to *service*, everything just now seems to indicate the common term, which may unite us with power and gladness in a common aim, as a renewed and glorified conception of that Kingdom. It is, I think, true that a time has come when once more 'the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand'; not in the sense of time, as though it should immediately appear, but in the sense that to-day it is accessible and within reach—near, if we could grasp it—'at the doors,' if we could admit it. We have claimed the soul for Christ, and we have

gained for Christ many souls; it is now time to claim for Him the world and its order. We have had a clear idea of the Christian life for the individual—now we need as clear perception of a Christian Society and Christian relationships, and of God's intention for the way of humanity as a whole. We need to work out the idea of the Kingdom of God in fact and practice and to reach one and the same conception of what it is, and to address our world with some plain sense of what it means to ourselves. To do this, we must learn to see it together: it must be the term of our fellowship, that in which we share, and the same to us all, because all of us see it with the same eyes.

Mr. Clutton-Brock tells us, and, I think, truly, that this means conversion, individual and social. What he does not tell us is the secret and power and method of conversion. How are we to be converted? In the past we have known conversion in one definite form—namely, as it comes about by contact with the overwhelming fact of Christ and His Cross—as it is illustrated in the typical conversions of a Paul, an Augustine, a Luther, a Wesley, a Chalmers, and in countless unnamed, uncelebrated examples, within our knowledge and in some measure within our experience. This conversion we know as adequate to revolutionize and to possess the entirety of the individual manhood—do we know any other which does so? We know that this conversion endues with spiritual capacity to appreciate all further spiritual truths—does any other conversion have this effect? We know that this conversion inspires and enables to social service and to success in such service, and in the past has stood behind the greatest social reformations—is there elsewhere evidence of similar incentive to toil or daring or sacrifice? And we know the potentiality of this conversion to induce fellowship. Those who (in their own phrase) have seen the truth as it is in Jesus and have given up to Him, they the world over understand each other, and they have fellowship with one another, and their fellowship is also with Apostles and with the Father and with the Son. If one may know the tree by its fruits, theirs may be recognized as a fellowship in the truth. And the truth in which their fellowship subsists is that of human need and Divine sufficiency. Behind it stands the power of a supernatural religion, a Divine Christ, an unreduced faith; that, it appears from a large enough induction, is adequate (some may think, is alone adequate) to effect supernatural conversion of the whole self—the conversion which Mr. Clutton-Brock desiderates, but for which he does not indicate an efficient cause. He implies, I think, that religion which does not produce conversion is inefficient; and if conversions have become infrequent, it may be time for us to re-examine our religious data and to endeavour an evangelical vitalization of our religious thinking and doing. Fellowship in service may, on examination of the records of Christian experience, be found to rest on the power of the Cross to convert the soul: all revivals have taken their departure from individual conversions; but now, in view of that hovering nearness of the Kingdom of God, there must be more—there must be fellowship in the vision and apprehension of the Kingdom, and Christ be known as the Saviour of society as well as of the man; the aim must be social conversion—the conviction of the public conscience that Christ's way is the only way for the world of men.

Entre Nous.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

Preaching the Church.

In his Bampton Lectures on the Doctrine of the Church, Dr. A. C. Headlam (remember who he is) warns us against much preaching of 'the Church.' He says: 'I would draw your attention to the methods of our Lord, and to the proportion observed in His teaching. It is only by comparatively slight indications, and to a large extent indirectly, that we learn that He intended to found a Church, or that a Church would be the natural outcome of His teaching. He only spoke of a Church twice. Clearly, if it is an essential part of His work it is a subordinate one. He preaches the Kingdom, not the Church. I believe that here also we may find a guide to ourselves. So far as my observation goes Christianity has always

failed when it has put teaching about the Church too prominently forward. We are told by those who addressed our soldiers in France, at a time when men were faced by the ultimate realities of life and death, that if a preacher began to talk about the Church, their interest at once flagged. There was no message there for those about to die. I cannot but think that this represents a profound truth. When people's thoughts are directed to the Ecclesiastical rather than the Spiritual—whatever form Ecclesiasticism may take, whether Romanism, or Catholicism, or Anglicanism, or Protestantism, devotion to Bishops or devotion to Presbyters, the Free Church movement or the Establishment—it is interesting to notice how little success there is, how little permanent result comes from the most unremitting efforts. I cannot but think that the continuous and pathetic failure of the Jesuit, who has for three centuries given up his life to an ideal which, in spite of his discipline, his sacrifice, and his intellectual ability, he never attains, has arisen from the fact that he has always put the Church first and the Gospel second. Our Lord founded the Church by preaching the Kingdom. We can only build up the Church by preaching the Gospel.'

SOME TOPICS.

Progress.

'The ideal which, beyond all others, characterizes the present age of almost all the nations of the world is the ideal of progress. Hardly anyone has any clear notion what he means by progress, or could explicate the idea; but the sentiment is very strong, though the idea is very vague. This idea also was unknown to the leading thinkers of antiquity and is of recent growth; yet it is so almost universally accepted, and it so permeates the mental atmosphere in every direction, that it is hard for us to realize how new a thing in the history of the world is the existence, and still more the effective dominance, of the idea.'

That being so (it is Mr. McDougall that tells us so), we shall expect that the Dean of St. Paul's will have no belief in it. And our expectation is more than fulfilled by the reading of Dr. Inge's Romanes Lecture for 1920 on *The Idea of Progress* (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; 2s. net). It is assuredly good reading. But progress? It is a 'superstition'; it has 'prejudicially affected the religious beliefs of our time': 'in fact, the superstition which is the subject of this lecture has distorted Christianity almost beyond recognition.' For individuals, however, 'the path of progress is always open; but, as Hesiod told us long before the Sermon on the Mount, it is a narrow path, steep and difficult, especially at first. There will never be a crowd gathered round this gate; "few there be that find it." For this reason, we must cut down our hopes for our nation, for Europe, and for humanity at large, to a very modest and humble aspiration.'

Inge-iana.

They are taken from *The Idea of Progress*.

'The Dark Ages knew that they were dark, and we hear little talk about progress during those seven centuries which, as far as we can see, might have been cut out of history without any great loss to posterity.'

'Civilization is a disease which is almost invariably fatal, unless its course is checked in time.'

'Democracy—the magic ballot-box—has few worshippers any longer except in America, where men will still shout for about two hours—and indeed much longer—that she is "great."'

'The progressive species have in many cases flourished for a while and then paid the supreme penalty. The living dreadnoughts of the Saurian age have left us their bones, but no progeny. But the microbes, one of which had the honour of killing Alexander the Great at the age of thirty-two, and so changing the whole course of history, survive and flourish. The microbe illustrates the wisdom of the maxim λάθε βιώρας. It took thousands of years to find him out. Our own species, being rather poorly provided by nature for offence and defence, had to live by its wits, and so came to the top. It developed many new needs, and set itself many insoluble problems. Physiologists like Metchnikoff have shown how very ill-adapted our bodies are to the tasks which we impose upon them; and in spite of the Spencerian identification of complexity with progress, our surgeons try to simplify our structure by forcibly removing various organs which they assure us that we do not need.'

Andrew Lang.

Or is it Henry James? For what can be done, what can *any* reviewer do, with *The Letters of Henry James* (Macmillan; 2 vols., 36s. net) except

quote—except quote a letter in toto, or at least a significant (we do not say characteristic, for what is Henry James is Henry James alone) part of a letter? We have decided to quote from a letter to Edmund Gosse, in the second volume, an appreciation (or something) of Andrew Lang.

Gosse had sent him a copy of his Literary Portraits. After other references, 'Beautiful too,' he says, 'the Bailey, the Horne and the Creighton—this last very rich and fine and touching. I envy you your having known so well so genial a creature as Creighton, with such largeness of endowment. You have done him very handsomely and tenderly; and poor little Shorthouse not to the last point of tenderness perhaps, but no doubt as handsomely, none the less, as was conceivably possible.'

And then Andrew Lang—'I won't deny to you that it was to your Andrew Lang I turned most immediately and with most suspense—and with most of an effect of drawing a long breath when it was over. It is very prettily and artfully brought off—but you would of course have invited me to feel with you how little you felt you were doing it as we should, so to speak, have "really liked." Of course there were the difficulties, and of course you had to defer in a manner to some of them; but your paper is of value just in proportion as you more or less overrode them. His recent extinction, the facts of long acquaintance and camaraderie, let alone the wonder of several of his gifts and the mass of his achievement, couldn't, and still can't, in his case, not be complicating, clogging and qualifying circumstances; but what a pity, with them all, that a figure so lending itself to a certain amount of interesting *real* truth-telling, should, honestly speaking, enjoy such impunity, as regards some of its idiosyncrasies, should get off so scot-free ("Scot"-free is exactly the word!) on the ground of its greatest hollowness, so much of its most "successful" puerility and perversity. Where I can't but feel that he *should* be brought to justice is in the matter of his whole "give-away" of the value of the wonderful chances he so continually enjoyed (enjoyed thanks to certain of his very gifts, I admit!)—give-away, I mean, by his *cultivation*, absolutely, of the puerile imagination and the fourth-rate opinion, the coming round to that of the old apple-woman at the corner as after all the good and the right as to any of the mysteries of mind or of art. His mixture of endowments and vacant holes, and "the making of the part" of each, would by themselves be matter for a really edifying critical study—for which, however, I quite recognise that the day and the occasion have already hurried heedlessly away. And I perhaps throw a disproportionate weight on the whole question—merely by reason of a late accident or two; such as my having recently read his (in two or three respects so able) Joan of Arc, or Maid of France, and turned over his just-published (I think posthumous) compendium of "English Literature," which lies on my table downstairs. The extraordinary inexpensiveness and childishness and impertinence of this latter gave to my sense the measure of a whole side of Lang, and yet which was one of the sides of his greatest flourishing. His extraordinary *voulu* Scotch provincialism crowns it and rounds it off; really making one at moments ask with what kind of an innermost intelligence such inanities and follies were compatible. The Joan of Arc is another matter, of course; but even there, with all the accomplishment, all the possession of detail, the sense of reality, the vision of the truths and processes of life, the light of experience and the finer sense of history, seem to me so wanting, that in spite of the thing's being written so intensely *at* Anatole France, and in spite of some of A. F.'s own (and so different!) perversities, one "kind of" feels and believes Andrew again and again bristlingly yet *bêtement* wrong, and Anatole sinuously, yet oh so wisely, right!'

Whistle better.

The Rev. James Learmount has published another volume of his *Fifty-two Talks to Young Folk* (Allenson; 5s. net). This is the seventh in succession. And the treasury is not exhausted. Mr. Learmount believes in quoting poetry—probably he can quote it. He is willing to tell a tale against himself.

'A minister was going whistling down a street, when a boy stopped him, and said, "Why, I could whistle better than that myself."

'"Could you?" said the minister. "Let me hear you."

'The boy started, and when he was done, said, "There, can you beat that?"

'"I'll try," said the minister.

'He did so, and beat the boy easily. When he was done, the boy said, "That's not so bad. Why don't you whistle like that always?"

'That boy had the right idea. We ought always to aim at the best.'

The Ephesian Twelve.

The Rev. C. H. K. Boughton, B.D., Vicar of Calverley and formerly Principal of Ripon Clergy College, has written an able, intelligible and acceptable book on *The Meaning of Holy Baptism* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). He finds that in the Apostolic Church 'Baptism was an outward rite administered by the Church to those in whose hearts the Holy Spirit had already done His regenerating work.' Two passages, however, present a difficulty, one in Acts 8 about the Samaritans, the other in Acts 19 about the twelve men at Ephesus. This is his solution: In Acts 8 'we have the story how Philip the deacon went down to a city of Samaria and preached Christ unto its people. The power of his preaching and the wonderfulness of his miracles of healing convinced them of the truth of his message; they received it and were filled with joy, and thereupon "they were baptized, both men and women." Some time afterwards the apostolic body at Jerusalem heard what Philip had done. Their action may best be stated in the words of the Bible: "They sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: (for as yet He was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus). Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." If this passage and the one in chap. xix. about the twelve men stood alone, we should certainly conclude from them that the Holy Spirit was not given at Baptism, but only at the ceremony which later on came to be called Confirmation. But in the light of our Lord's personal history, and in deference to the weight of the evidence showing the normal activity of the Spirit before Baptism, we are driven by consistency to interpret the phrases used in the stories of the Samaritans and the Ephesians to mean that the Holy Spirit was indeed present in the hearts of these people in regenerating power before their Baptism, but that there were certain other spiritual gifts which were bestowed upon them in answer to further prayer at the time of the laying on of apostolic hands. The regeneration of the Ephesian men before Baptism may even be considered as implied in the fact that they "heard" Paul.'

NEW POETRY.

Edmond Holmes.

Mr. Edmond Holmes has reached the age when men write their autobiography. He has accordingly written *In Quest of an Ideal: An Autobiography* (Cobden-Sanderson; 6s. net). It is not a large book and few of the facts of his life are recorded in it—clear evidence that Mr. Holmes is not so old as he thinks he is. The few facts are these. He was born in Ireland, of the aristocracy, and as he grew up he 'duly repeated at regular intervals' Mrs. Alexander's lines:

> The rich man in his castle,
> The poor man at his gate,
> God made them, high or lowly,
> And ordered their estate.

In early youth he came with his family to England, went to school, to Oxford, was appointed an Inspector of Schools, wrote poetry and some prose, was at last made Chief Inspector of elementary schools for the whole of England (though he had not yet discovered the meaning of education), and all the while was out in search of an ideal—'an ideal which would give a meaning and purpose to my life'—which he has not yet found. He has not found his ideal, but he has found a creed and he is content. This is the creed:

> 'They say that our cause is broken. I see with the eyes of death,
> Whose mists are stealing around to hide me away from pain.
> I shall sleep as a little child on the bosom of one deep faith,
> That never a wound was wasted and never a blow was vain.'

We have placed Mr. Holmes among the poets. He is a prose writer undoubtedly, one of the clearest and most emotional. But he is also a poet—or has been at intervals—he says he is not one now. This is one of the latest sonnets. Its title is

THE TRUE REWARD.

> What do I seek? What does my soul desire?
> To give desire a fuller, freer scope:
> To make intenser its intensest fire:
> To pass beyond the horizon of its hope.
> What vision lures me on? What dream sustains?

No prize of victory. No garnered fruit.
I reap my harvest in my wounds, my pains,
The stress of strife, the ardour of pursuit.
Why do I strive? That I may strive the more.
Why do I toil? Not for life's daily bread.
Why do I climb? That I may learn to soar.
Success, achievement is the doom I dread.
Have I succeeded? One reward I claim—
A task beyond my compass and my aim.

John Bunker.

Mr. John Bunker is one of the American poets whom the able editors of American periodicals welcome gladly and pay handsomely. His volume *Shining Fields and Dark Towers* is published in New York by the John Lane Company, and in London by Mr. John Lane of the Bodley Head (6s. net). The most striking poem in it is a long one written in memory of Francis Thompson and called 'Quest and Haven.' It is almost as wonderful in its rich imagery and command of language as the Hound of Heaven itself, though we do not say that it will be as immortal. We quote—

THE GREAT REFUSAL.

To casual seeing he was just the same
That he had always been; he dressed the same
And walked and talked as he had always done,
And when he laughed the old familiar chuckle
Came in just pat as it was used to do;
So that it was no wonder bland outsiders
Thought him the man that they had always known.
But though he made no sign and walked securely
The usual round of every-day affairs,
He was no more the man that he had been
Than I am Julius Cæsar. For when sounded
For his behoof that strange imperious call
Which, name it fate or duty, each man hears
Lifting above the noises of the world
Once with authentic summons in his soul,—
Because it spoke to him in too stern fashion
Bidding him go the difficult way of pain
And stress and starry loneliness that leads
To the fair summit of one austere glory,
He turned aside, and therewith pulled about him
His house of life forever. A difference slight
It might have seemed, and common: he but chose
One path instead of another, merely took
What seemed the way of facile treading; yet
By the fine irony of the unforeseen
The path he chose became for him indeed
The difficult way of pain and loneliness
That leads to God knows whither. So he passed
With his strict doom upon him down the days,
Dogged to the end by diligent regret.
And though he spoke no word and walked securely
The usual round of every-day affairs,
Within his eyes I caught the look of one
Who bears a secret trouble at his heart;
And now I never see him but I think
Of the heroic path he might have trod
And those dim peaks of his refusèd greatness.

Auriol Hay.

The most striking poems in *Images* by Auriol Hay (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net) are in the end and in French. There is in the English poems an occasional coinage of doubtful felicity. As—

In the gardens of Aranjuez,
Night and Day,
Fountains play,
In silver pools do mermaids laze.

This is the author's somewhat comfortless creed:

I lie upon my couch and dream about
The mystery of Earth.
The flowers, the stars, the beauty of a night,
And all the truths removed from mortal sight;
Our miraculous birth
From nothing into something,
Then once again to nothing.
What matter, if we have that peace within
Our soul, that inward calm and ardent faith,
That, nought in life is vain or purposeless.
Although our very being be a wraith
And, we but pilgrims in this vale of tears.
One little moment in a thousand years,
Then, we are dust; and infinitely less.
Oh! happy those, who in their hearts do know
That passing out, our spirits freed but go
Into the Great Beyond this earthly night;
As one who steps from darkness into light.

W. H. Hamilton.

Mr. Hamilton's volume *Gauldry, and other Verses* (Cupar: Innes; 1s. 6d. net) is good reading, best

of all for the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Fife. The poems in Scots have the advantage. 'The Consolations of Religion'—the complaint of the bawbee that it was useless now except as an offering in Church—should give the little book a circulation.

William Force Stead.

William Force Stead has given his poems the title of *Verd Antique* (Blackwell; 2s. 6d. net). If there were but this one poem in the book it would be bought:

PILGRIMAGE.

My way lay east and north,
The road seemed hard to me;
From Eden driven forth,
I toiled toward Calvary.

The night hung deep around,
There was no moon or star;
A short way some have found,
I found the journey far.

Yet there at last I came,
And saw Christ on the tree:
His wounds were rosy flame,
And His eyes were kind to me.

I thought to rest me there,
And yet my hope was vain:
Another night I dare,
And journey on again.

Yea, I must onward still,
So far the goal I seek;
And when I climb the hill,
Behold, a mountain peak:

But in the night, afar
Two beacons lighten me:
Ahead, the Morning Star,
Behind me, Calvary.

It is the simplicity of the metre that makes the charm, thrusting forward the sublimity of the thought. What other fact on earth could move men so, or be able to endure this simpleness?

John Oxenham.

John Oxenham has reached the height of his ambition. He has written a Life of Jesus in verse. Boldly enough, he gives it the title of '*Gentlemen —The King!*' (Methuen; 2s. net). The great events are retold in blank verse, and interspersed throughout are songs or choruses in rhyme. It is a supremely difficult thing to do: only one here and there has ever even attempted it. But John Oxenham has at least some of the gifts. He has simplicity of thought, a sense of fitting words, and a mind taken captive by the mind of Christ.

This is how he handles the great scene of Christ's last departure for Jerusalem—'He steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem':

So, thitherward he boldly set his face,
Prepared to meet whatever might befall,
And thither, with reluctant feet, his friends
Accompanied him, close companied themselves
By doubts and fears. For they had counted on
A triumph worthy of his mighty works,
And for their zeal a fitting recompence.
But now—he spoke of tribulations sore,
And even of death as his reward and theirs.

So different this from all their early hopes,
Eye questioned eye with puzzled wonderment
And found no consolation,—only dread
Of what the future held for him and them.

But he pressed boldly on, with steadfast face,
To that last struggle with the evil powers.
'Perchance if One should die for them!—
Perchance!'
Rang in his heart and filled him with new fire,—
'Perchance if One should die for them!—
Perchance!'

And that brave figure pressing on in front
Gave fleeting courage to his followers;—
But they were doubtful, and their feet were slow.

Was ever such a contest?—One brave soul
Aglow with loving zeal against a world
Sunk deep in sin and all content therewith!
One soul against the world! But such a soul!—
The world's creator pleading with the world
That he had made—and pleading all in vain.
He, the All-Powerful, yet powerless
To save his wandering world against its will.

Love only could retrieve it and redeem,
And Love it held in lightest of esteem.

See now this marvel of unchanging grace,
This crowning proof of Love Omnipotent!—
One touch upon the intricate machine
And Earth had vanished like a wind-blown spark;
One rending crash—and chaos—and an end,—
A flaming streak athwart a midnight sky,
And dwellers on the other spheres might say,—
'Another star has vanished into space;
Was it, perchance, inhabited like ours?'

But, with desire, he had desired man's good,
And, short of ending him, he could but strive
To win his heart and wean him from his sin.
And, for the love he bore him, he bore too
The burden of his sin and wilfulness.

Godfrey Elton.

A Queen's College Miscellany is a courageous venture. The Provost, Mr. Edward Armstrong, defends it: 'The spirit of College life naturally expresses itself in common rather than individual action. This has hitherto been more obvious on the physical than on the intellectual side. In athletics team-work is triumphant; in literature the development has been less pronounced; essay societies there are indeed in every College, and from time to time more private coteries, such as that of which Walter Pater was the product. Our MISCELLANY is intended to carry the process a step further, to prove that team-work—the harmonious development of varying styles and individuals—is possible in prose and poetry. It must be all to the good that our College should vie with others, in things of the spirit as in those of the flesh, and within the College that literary talent should share the distinction which has hitherto been reserved for the athlete. The seed of the solitary worker is too often sown upon the wayside, or not sown at all. Common action will prepare the ground, fence it round, will stimulate growth, or check superfluous luxuriance, and above all, harvest the refined produce. It may be objected that no College could continually provide a literary team whose output would be worth publishing. This is true enough; talent may pass from one College to another. Yet whether the leaves of our MISCELLANY fall prematurely or in due course, there is the consoling thought that deciduous trees are not the least fruitful.'

The periodical is to be published at the Queen's College, Oxford, at 3s. 6d. net.

We make no pretence of reviewing so miscellaneous a collection of prose and poetry—it is enough to say that we have read it from cover to cover. The poem we quote we quote simply for shortness. Its author is Mr. Godfrey Elton:

THE SURVIVOR.

I found him in department C.O. 10—
Four rows of ribbons, D.S.O., C.B.,
Brown, handsome, fearless; born to handle men;
Brushed, buttoned, spurred. Whom did I want to see?

'Men you can't send for, General,' I said,
'How great soever your expense of ink;
Men you've forgotten; the unribboned dead
Who fell because you were too brave to think.'

The Huntington Palimpsest.

BY THE REVEREND P. A. GORDON CLARK, PERTH.

IN a lecture delivered at the Union Theological Seminary, New York, in 1914, the Rev. E. S. Buchanan told how he had become associated with the late Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury, the famous Vulgate scholar, who encouraged him in his devotion to research work on the Latin Text of the N.T. Mr. Buchanan is now well known as the editor of the Four Gospels from the Codex Corbeiensis (*a*) and from the Codex Veronensis (*b*), and other sacred Latin Texts. The Latin Text, stereotyped by Jerome (*c.* A.D. 382), was called into existence owing to the variety of Latin Texts used

in different localities. In Central Europe, where Jerome's version had behind it the strong authority of the Church, these Old Latin Texts gradually passed out of use, and were forgotten; but they remained in use, and consequently were more likely to be preserved in places far from the centre of authority and influence, in, *e.g.*, Spain, cut off as it was 'from communication with the main body of Christendom by the Moorish Invasion, which, for a time, confined the Christian Visigoths to the north-western corner of the peninsula.'[1] Mr. Buchanan believes that these Spanish (as well as Irish) MSS., a number of which have been discovered, enable us to get behind the Text of A.D. 382 so as to reconstruct a Text used between A.D. 122 and 180 or 170. It was after that date that, as he says, 'ecclesiastics went over the Gospel manuscripts, and altered a good many verses to bring them into conformity with the schemes and ideals of the hierarchy which had already begun to develop.' He sees in these changes 'a definite purpose in the minds of the revisers to suppress the Holy Spirit, for in the earliest form of the Gospels known to us, the Old Latin form, the personality of the Holy Spirit is clearly shown.' Mr. Buchanan was the Curator of MSS. in the Museum of the Hispanic Society of America, in New York, when a Latin Manuscript from the Library of the Cathedral at Tarragona came into its possession consisting of 432 leaves in double columns of 22 lines to the page. It proved to be a Palimpsest—the Huntington Palimpsest—of the Gospels, the under writing in which presents a text varying in a great variety of respects from those previously known. Mr. Buchanan has deciphered this, and now presents us with a translation of the Gospel of Luke.

The outstanding characteristic of the MSS. may be indicated by one word—'SPIRIT.' God is named 'the Father of Spirits,' men are designated as 'the spirits of men'; there are 'evil spirits that hate the spirits of men,' Jesus is 'the Saviour of Spirits,' and 'the spirits of men are saved from evil spirits by the word of the Saviour of Spirits that he preached to the spirits of men.' Such words and phrases are in almost every verse of the Gospel. The angel of the Annunciation is 'an angel of the Holy Spirit'; his message to the Virgin is 'I bring to the spirits of men glad tidings of salvation from evil spirits by the Saviour of Spirits.' The admonition as to the hearing ear becomes 'He that hath a spiritual ear let him hear what the Holy Spirit saith to the spirits of men.'

The omissions in the MSS. are numerous and significant, but what is of more interest are the various readings. In chap. ix., Peter's answer to Christ's question, 'Who say ye that I am?" is 'Thou, and thy Father, and the Holy Spirit are God alone,' to which there is added, 'And whatsoever the Holy Spirit shall bind on earth, I and my Father will bind in heaven; and whatsoever the Holy Spirit shall unbind on earth, I and my Father will unbind in heaven.' Chap. x., ver. 384, reads as follows: 'Two women who were slaves, and had a brother named Lazarus, received him into their house. One of the slaves was cumbered about much serving, and stood up and said, Lord dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? Bid her therefore that she serve me. The Lord Jesus said, The Son of man loveth the spirits of men, not the service of men.' The admonition, 16^{18}, as to the service of two masters reads: 'No man can serve two masters. Every servant will serve his own master. No man can serve the Holy Spirit and evil spirits. And the Pharisees who were serving evil spirits derided him.'

The words of the Lord upon the Cross and of the penitent thief are given as follows: 'And the Lord Jesus said, Father, forgive them; for they serve evil spirits which hate the spirit of the Son of man.' 'The other said, Jesus, Son of God, free me. And the Lord Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, This day thou shalt obtain the glory of the spirits of the children of God.' Further illustrations are unnecessary. Enough has been said to excite interest and to raise questions as to the age, the importance of the MS., the persons whose views it represents, and how its strange language came into contact with our more familiar Gospels.

[1] F. G. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, p. 177. *Gospel of St. Luke* (Unjudaized Version), Deciphered and Translated by E. S. Buchanan, M.A., B.Sc. (London: C. F. Roworth).

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, 'Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

FOR REFERENCE
Do Not Take From This Room
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY